

The next amendment was, on page 163, after line 3, to insert:
The next amendment was, on page 163, after line 3, to insert:

For furniture for the Senate Office Building and for labor and material incident thereto and repairs thereof, window shades, awnings, carpets, glass for windows and bookcases, desk lamps, window ventilators, name plates for doors, and committee tables, electric fans, etc., \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Government Printing Office," on page 164, line 24, after the word "Capitol," to strike out "\$2,500" and insert "\$3,000," and on page 165, line 9, to strike out "\$148,590" and insert "\$149,090," so as to read:

Office of Public Printer: Public Printer, \$6,000; purchasing agent, \$3,600; chief clerk, \$2,750; accountant, \$2,500; assistant purchasing agent, \$2,500; cashier and paymaster, \$2,500; clerk in charge of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the Capitol, \$3,000; private secretary, \$2,500; assistant accountant, \$2,250; chief timekeeper, \$2,000; paying teller, \$2,000; clerks—4 at \$2,000 each, 10 of class 4, 13 of class 3, 12 of class 2, 10 of class 1, 15 at \$1,000 each, 6 at \$900 each; paymaster's guard, \$1,000; doorkeeper—chief, \$1,200, 1 \$1,200, 5 assistants at \$1,000 each; 2 messengers, at \$840 each; delivery men—chief \$1,200, 5 at \$950 each; telephone switchboard operator, \$720; 3 assistant telephone switchboard operators, at \$600 each; 7 messenger boys, at \$420 each; in all, \$149,090.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 167, line 10, in the item for public printing, public binding, and paper for public printing and binding, etc., to reduce the appropriation from \$6,286,890 to \$5,826,390.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 168, line 1, after the word "sum," to strike out "\$7,348,700" and insert "\$6,888,700," so as to read:

In all, for public printing and binding, including salaries of office force, payments for holidays and leave of absence, and the last-named sum, \$6,888,700.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 168, to reduce the item for printing and binding for Congress, including proceedings and debates, from \$2,290,000 to \$2,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 168, line 15, to reduce the appropriation for printing for the Treasury Department, including printing required by the Federal farm loan act, from \$750,000 to \$700,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 168, line 17, to reduce the item for printing for the War Department, its bureaus and offices, from "\$450,000" to "\$400,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 168, line 24, to reduce the item for printing for the Navy Department, including not exceeding \$50,000 for the Hydrographic Office, from "\$250,000" to "\$225,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 169, line 4, to reduce the item for printing for the Interior Department, including not exceeding \$25,000 for the publication of the Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education and not exceeding \$10,000 for printing miners' circulars, from "\$285,000" to "\$265,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 169, line 16, to reduce the item for printing for the United States Geological Survey, for engraving the illustrations necessary for the annual report of the director, and for the monographs, professional papers, bulletins, water-supply papers, and the report on mineral resources, and for printing and binding the same publications, of which sum not more than \$45,000 may be used for engraving, from "\$150,000" to "\$145,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 169, line 17, to reduce the item for printing for the Civil Service Commission from "\$75,000" to "\$65,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 169, line 21, after the numerals "\$20,000," to insert "to be immediately available," so as to read:

For the Smithsonian Institution: For printing and binding the Annual Reports of the Board of Regents, with general appendices, the editions of which shall not exceed 10,000 copies, \$20,000, to be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 170, line 15, to reduce the item for printing for the Department of Justice from "\$40,000" to "\$35,000."

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I am about to suggest the absence of a quorum—

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator withhold that suggestion until I can present an amendment?

Mr. HARRISON. I withhold the suggestion.

Mr. ROBINSON. I ask leave to send to the Secretary's desk an amendment to the pending bill, which I desire to have printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAPPER in the chair). The amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas will be printed and lie on the table.

The amendment submitted by Mr. ROBINSON proposes to appropriate \$350,000 to enable the Secretary of Labor to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of wage earners of the United States; to improve their working conditions; to advance their opportunities for profitable employment by maintaining a national system of employment offices; and to coordinate the public employment offices throughout the country by furnishing and publishing information as to opportunities for employment and by maintaining a system for clearing labor between the several States, etc.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I withdraw my suggestion in reference to the absence of a quorum.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator in charge of the bill that now is a very good time to take a recess or adjournment.

RECESS.

Mr. WARREN. I presume all Senators are as anxious as I am to dispose of the appropriation bill, but we have had a pretty long day, and I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, February 7, 1921, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, February 5, 1921.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., pastor of Calvary Methodist Episcopal Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, to-day we write again upon the stone of our memorial, hitherto hath the Lord helped us. Continue to give us Thy daily ministries, that we may know what is the good and the acceptable way. Deliver us from all bigotry, all narrowness, and at the last, when we can not work any more, catch us when we fall. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE FOR SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1921.

The SPEAKER appointed Mr. BUTLER, of Pennsylvania, to act as Speaker pro tempore during the memorial exercises in honor of the late Representative GARLAND, of Pennsylvania, on Sunday, February 6, 1921.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE BOOHER.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Sunday, February 20, 1921, be set aside as a day for addresses on the life, character, and public services of the late Representative BOOHER, of Missouri.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that Sunday, February 20, 1921, be set aside for memorial exercises in memory of the late Representative BOOHER, of Missouri, to follow the exercises for the late Senator MARTIN, of Virginia. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 15943) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of the further consideration of the Army appropriation bill, with Mr. WALSH in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I believe when the committee rose last evening an amendment was pending to strike out the paragraph, offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TILSON resumed the chair.

The Clerk read as follows:

ORDNANCE STORES, AMMUNITION.

For the development, manufacture, purchase, and maintenance of airplane bombs; of ammunition for small arms and for hand use for reserve supply; of ammunition for burials at the National Soldiers' Home in Washington, D. C., and of ammunition for firing the morning and evening gun at military posts prescribed by General Orders, No. 70, Headquarters of the Army, dated July 23, 1867, and at National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and its several branches, including National Soldiers' Home at Washington, D. C., and soldiers' and sailors' State homes, \$750,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This morning I received a letter from an officer at Camp Meade, Md., concerning a young man 16 years of age, who enlisted in the Army and whose dependent parents applied for his discharge because of his minority. This officer tells me regarding this young man, who lives in Nolan County, Tex., that he has given the young man to understand that he will be discharged without honor and that his pay will be forfeited and that he will be turned loose or held at least until money is sent from home to pay his way back to Nolan County, Tex. Upon such representation to the young man that he will be discharged without honor the young man has decided to stay in the Army, but upon his demand, the officer says, an allotment has been made to his dependent parents, to be paid monthly.

Yesterday, as a reason for doing away with the amendment to stop this matter, discharging of such minors without honor, it was stated that these young men might some day come back and ask for a pension, and that we did not want to pay any money out if they should be hurt. So it will be seen how it goes. The officers of the Army would rather charge this Government monthly with an allotment to dependent parents and keep the 16-year-old boy in the Army to do service, when, on the other hand, if they turned them loose they claim they are turning them loose with dishonor, and they admit they can keep them in the service with honor, but if forced to turn them out they go out in dishonor. Nolan County, Tex., is a long way from Camp Meade, Md. It means much to the dependent father and mother of the 16-year-old minor to have to dig up money to pay the boy's way home and have that boy's pay forfeited and have him branded with dishonor from time until eternity.

I have talked with a number of men on the Republican side of the aisle since the gentleman from Ohio, Dr. FESS, said yesterday that he was going to have the amendment stricken from the bill when we got back into the House.

My good friend Dr. FESS is going to find out that some of his privates and second lieutenants on his side, against whom so much criticism has been directed lately because, forsooth, they appear in their places and once in a while ask for recognition respecting measures affecting people in their own districts, are going to vote differently from what he thinks. Why, one prominent gentleman on the Republican side of the aisle had the assurance to stand in his place and state to the Chair that he would like to know what right the Chairman had to recognize an ordinary Member when a member of the committee wanted to be recognized; but, thank God, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] was in the chair, and the gentleman from Connecticut told that arrogant Congressman that in the House of Representatives every Member stands on an equal footing. I want to say to some of my Republican friends, who are unfortunately privates and second lieutenants here in this House, that the reason they have not just as much right as every other Member is because they do not assert their rights. Assert your rights, like the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] did, when he first came here, and you will have these fellows looking up to you and have them eating out of your hand just as they are eating out of his hand now. [Laughter and applause.] It is because you sit here and let them run over your rights, that your rights are not upheld.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL TROPHY AND MEDALS FOR RIFLE CONTESTS.

For the purpose of furnishing a national trophy and medals and other prizes to be provided and contested for annually, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, said contest to be open to the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the National Guard or Organized Militia of the several States, Territories, and of the District of Columbia, members of rifle clubs, and civilians, and for the cost of the trophy, prizes, and medals herein provided for, and for the promotion of rifle practice throughout the United States, including the reimbursement of necessary expenses of members of the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, to be expended for the purposes hereinbefore prescribed, under the direction of the Secretary of War, \$10,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. What authority of law is there for this?

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I will state to the gentleman that this paragraph has been carried in the Army appropriation bills for the last 12 years, that I remember, and for many other years, undoubtedly. I think it is based upon section 113 of the national defense act, for the encouragement of rifle practice, where authority for civilian rifle practice is given, and under the interpretation of the word "encouragement" the giving of suitable trophies or medals undoubtedly would be authorized.

Mr. WALSH. How much was expended last year?

Mr. ANTHONY. This amount of \$10,000 has been carried from year to year. We have not got the expenditure. We have no record of the expenditure.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the language of section 113 is not sufficient to warrant the expenditure of money for the purchase and distribution of trophies and medals. If every time they use the word "encourage" in a Federal statute to encourage any branch of industry or any particular line of activity we can spend money for medals and trophies, it seems to me that the interpretation put upon the statute will have to be very closely guarded. Now, there are plenty of other ways of encouraging this very useful activity other than awarding these trophies and prizes. And as the committee is not advised as to the amount expended last year, and apparently it was not of very much importance to the service or they would have had additional facts, I submit that, there having been no reduction, the matter can be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman a copy of the national defense act? It does not happen to be at the desk.

Mr. ANTHONY. If the Chair will permit, we have the information asked for by the gentleman from Massachusetts. In 1920 there was expended \$3,403 for this purpose.

Mr. WALSH. How much was spent in the year 1919?

Mr. ANTHONY. Five thousand and thirty dollars.

Mr. WALSH. And 1918?

Mr. ANTHONY. Three thousand eight hundred dollars and fifty-three cents.

Mr. WALSH. I do not see why the committee did not recommend a reduction, as they have never used \$10,000.

Mr. ANTHONY. Those were years immediately following a year when there was not much opportunity for this kind of work. In years before the war they spent \$9,993, \$9,342, and so forth, showing the entire amount was used.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is unable to find in section 113 of the national defense act, referred to by the gentleman from Kansas, any reference whatever to encouragement of rifle practice by the offering of trophies or medals for contests. Is there anywhere specific law authorizing this appropriation to which the gentleman can cite the Chair?

Mr. ANTHONY. On page 76, section 113, is the paragraph entitled "Encouragement of rifle practice."

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; the subheading of section 113 is "Encouragement of rifle practice," but upon reading the paragraph it does not mention anything about trophies or for anything else, except the furnishing of a reasonable number of standard military rifles, such quantity of ammunition as may be available in conducting such rifle practice, and also rifle ranges. In other words, this section deals with the furnishing of facilities for rifle practice and does not in anywise specifically refer to encouragement by means of trophies, medals, or anything of that kind. While the Chair is disposed to make a liberal construction of the rule, it is difficult to find anything in this paragraph upon which to found a favorable construction. Unless the gentleman from Kansas is able to furnish the Chair more substantial assistance than he has thus far, the Chair will be compelled to sustain the point of order. The Chair sustains the point of order.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

AUTOMATIC MACHINE RIFLES.

For the purchase, manufacture, test, repair, and maintenance of automatic machine rifles, or other automatic or semiautomatic guns, including their mounts, sights, and equipments, and the machinery necessary for their manufacture, to remain available until June 30, 1923, \$500,000.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to say something on a subject which has been discussed here at considerable length. If it were not such an important matter I would feel like apologizing for taking up the time of the committee further in reference to the matter of the discharge of soldiers without honor who enlisted under age. In June, 1916, as you remember, the National Guard was called out for Federal military service. I was at that time an officer of the National Guard. For a time I was detailed to recruiting service. Into my headquarters there came one morning a fine upstanding boy, a boy about my size. I asked him how old he was. He said he was 18 years of age. He looked large enough to be 18, but his face looked rather young. I asked him, for my own protection, where his parents lived. He said both of his parents were dead. I enlisted him and administered the oath of enlistment. Last summer at Denver that boy came into my office again. He told me he had been discharged from the military service in the Army in 1918, because of fraudulent enlistment, because he had enlisted under age, and that his father had come out to California and got him discharged. He had not asked for his discharge, and had spent about a year and two-thirds in the faithful performance of military duty for the United States. He did not get out by his own volition, but he was gotten out because his family had taken him out. He had, of course, lied to me, the recruiting officer who took him in. There has been a good deal of talk about the careless recruiting officer. I endeavored not to be careless, but it was not the practice to search birth records, especially in distant cities, when the President was asking for men. When this boy came into my office last summer he asked me to help him because he was sick. He had tuberculosis, contracted in the military service of the United States. He could not get compensation, he could not get vocational training, and he could not get a job because it was the custom in my town to ask a young man if he had been in the military service, and when prospective employers saw this young man come into their offices, and when he said he had been but was armed only with a dishonorable discharge they had no use for him and no time for his explanations. The boy was a good soldier. He was faithful and attentive in the performance of his duties. I never saw a better soldier. He was under my command for a number of months.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. VAILE. Gladly.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman, who has been an officer in his country's Army, believe that that young man, who performed a year and a half of honorable service for his country, ought to live under a dishonorable stigma all his life?

Mr. VAILE. I do not believe the same stigma should be attached to him that is attached to a man that deserts and is apprehended, and after desertion gets a dishonorable discharge, or to a man who steals from his comrades, or to a man who commits any one of a number of military offenses involving the stigma of moral turpitude. Our history is full of records of men who enlisted under age.

If they served out their enlistment, whether their parents knew about it or not, they got an honorable discharge. This boy, if he had been allowed to serve out his enlistment would have had an honorable discharge. It is not fair to class the two in the same group.

Mr. FIELDS. Under the present regulation, this boy is classed in the same group as a man who had stolen from an officer?

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Does not the gentleman think that we ought to pass a regulation to give these boys an honorable discharge?

Mr. VAILE. I think so. The suggestion was made the other day by my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRAGO] that if we let the amendment stay in it would put honorable discharges of old soldiers on the same footing as discharges of men who were taking advantage of their own wrong in order to get

out. Practically it seems to me that the only effect would be that recruiting officers would be still more careful in getting men into the service. They would protect the Government by being very sure that a man was not under age.

Mr. CRAGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAILE. Yes.

Mr. CRAGO. Does the gentleman believe that a young man who goes to a recruiting officer, and gets into the Army under 18 years of age, and at the end of 30 days goes to that officer and tells him that he was under age, and wants his pay, that he ought to have it?

Mr. VAILE. If he earned his pay, he ought to have it.

Mr. CRAGO. I am not opposed to a discharge for a man who has gone into the service, if he is under 18.

Mr. VAILE. Suppose he serves half of his service?

Mr. CRAGO. If he serves all of it, or no matter how much he serves, he is not given a dishonorable discharge.

Mr. VAILE. This man was given a dishonorable discharge.

Mr. CRAGO. He is not given a dishonorable discharge for that. He is simply given a discharge that is not an honorable discharge.

Mr. VAILE. His service, when he went in, was as honorable and faithful as any service for the country could be.

Mr. CRAGO. That was the foolish act of his parents.

Mr. VAILE. Was it a foolish act in trying to get him out? It was his parents' act that did it.

Mr. CRAGO. That is it.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. They took advantage of the fact that he had been fraudulently enlisted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. VAILE. It is true that they did have hold of the fact that it was a fraudulent enlistment, but "fraudulent," it seems to me, is a mighty harsh word to apply to a boy less than 18 years of age whose fraud was committed in an endeavor to serve his country. The same kind of language should not be applied to him that you apply to a man who steals from his comrades or a man who deserts and afterwards is apprehended. The trouble is that you class both of those things in the same way and punish with the same penalty.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The law says that if an original entry is wrong, anything that follows it is wrong.

Mr. VAILE. We have corrected a good many of them that were made in good faith.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I judged from the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania on yesterday that a separate vote will be demanded upon the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] as amended, which provides that the Secretary of War shall be directed to honorably discharge from the Army all soldiers under 18 years of age. Now, what is the situation? Let us analyze the proposition from a practical point of view. First, the Army is going to be reduced. The resolution which passed this House a few days ago, followed by this appropriation bill, insures a reduction in the enlisted personnel. Now, what class of soldiers shall the Secretary of War discharge? If it were left to you, what class would you discharge, and what is the situation with regard to the enlisted personnel of the Army at this time? There is no doubt that a great campaign has been on for recruiting the Army, and there have been at least very zealous efforts on the part of the recruiting officers. I would not charge that all recruiting officers have thrown out every inducement, right or wrong, that they could throw out, to induce boys to enter the service, but there are cases, and many of them, where the matter has been dealt with in the most slipshod way, and these boys of 15, 16, and 17 have been enlisted into the service when in fact the recruiting officers knew that they were under 18 years of age. In many cases their parents have complained, and have even gone to the extent of securing their release with discharge without honor. It is my policy, and it ought to be the policy of every Member of the House, to fully explain to his constituent when he writes to him requesting the discharge of a boy under 18 years of age, that a discharge under those circumstances will be a discharge without honor. Very few of them will proceed, when they have that information, to secure the discharge. But if the parent does insist it puts the boy in a most unfortunate position.

The young man who enlists in the Army, although he may have stated that he was 18 years of age when he was under 18, really was not prompted by ulterior motives, but by patriotic motives. It is one of the indiscretions of youth. But you

should not deal with the tender youth under 18 years of age who, prompted by his patriotism, makes a statement that he is 18 years of age when he is not as you would deal with the man who has committed theft or some other crime through willful design. [Applause.]

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FIELDS. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. In the case where a young man does it from patriotic motives, as you say, do you think we ought to write in the law that after he is in 30 days, under the conditions you speak of, he has the right to get out and be discharged and get an honorable discharge?

Mr. FIELDS. I am glad the gentleman from Illinois asked that question, because it brings me to the point I wanted to discuss, and I might have overlooked it. Now, as we are reducing the Army at this time, let us clean the slate, and then I trust if the War Department will not prescribe and enforce a regulation to prevent the enlistment of boys under 18 years without the consent of their parents that the Committee on Military Affairs will bring in a bill providing for regulations by which men shall be enlisted in the future that will make it incumbent upon enlisting officers to ascertain the age of the recruit from somebody besides the boy himself. With our census reports, with the census of the schools in every community, with the data on every hand from which to ascertain the ages of the boys, there is no excuse for any recruiting officer taking into the service a boy under 18 years of age.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

Mr. WALSH. I object.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. FIELDS. I am a member of the Committee on Military Affairs. I have not taken up much time on this bill.

Mr. WALSH. The subject the gentleman is discussing has been discussed and disposed of already.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I give notice that unless the debate is on the paragraph that has been read, I shall have to ask for the regular order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota. He ought to be heard on it.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the gentleman from South Dakota has offered an amendment, and ought to be heard on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is out of order.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, a point of order has been raised.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order. The gentleman from South Dakota made the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. There was some confusion. Did the gentleman from South Dakota make the point of no quorum?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I did, Mr. Chairman; but I withdraw the point of no quorum, and move to strike out the last three words.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already recognized the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. After that the Chair will recognize the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CONNALLY. Under this item for the purchase of automatic machine rifles, can the gentleman from Kansas, in charge of the bill, tell us how many automatic machine rifles the Army now has?

Mr. ANTHONY. Of Browning machine guns, model 1917, we have 61,222; Browning automatic rifles, 80,245; Browning aircraft machine guns, 2,965; Marlin aircraft machine guns, 31,433; Lewis aircraft machine guns, 36,552; Vickers aircraft machine guns, 5,743; Vickers 11-millimeter machine guns, 2,433; Vickers ground type machine guns, 8,291; Browning tank machine guns, 1,806; Marlin tank machine guns, 2,646.

Mr. CONNALLY. In view of the fact that each soldier under this Army of 150,000 would have about two of these guns apiece, what is the occasion for purchasing more?

Mr. ANTHONY. The money is asked for the development of new types of large-caliber machine guns with which it is intended to equip the larger types of aircraft.

Mr. SISSON. In addition to that, if the chairman of the subcommittee will permit, that is for the maintenance of the guns we already have.

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not asking about the maintenance but about the purchase.

Mr. ANTHONY. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] is right. We have 273,000 machine guns.

Mr. CONNALLY. Then why purchase more, if the Army is already supplied?

Mr. ANTHONY. That is the purpose of it. We have cut it down to \$500,000, which is for the purchase of guns of new types.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota moves to strike out the last three words.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, this amendment just discussed, affecting the enlistment and discharge of young men under 18 years of age, ought to be in the bill, but it ought to be modified. When the matter came up in the House yesterday quite a good many speeches were made about it, and it was the tacit understanding of the members of this committee and the members of the Committee on Military Affairs that the word "honorably" was not to be inserted in the amendment, and that the word "or" would not take the place of the word "and." The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Wingo] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDWELL], who made those amendments were not parties to that agreement, and consequently have in no way violated it.

Mr. WINGO. If the gentleman will permit, I was the author of the amendment, and I refused to make an agreement. The gentleman's memory is at fault if he does not recall it.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Certainly. The gentleman was not a party to the agreement, and he would not violate the agreement if he had made it.

Mr. WINGO. I specifically refused to make an agreement.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. My object in offering that amendment was to see that these discharged men secured sufficient money to permit them to return to their homes, receive pay for the time they had put in the service, and be treated with the same courtesy that was given to the conscientious objectors during the war and upon their discharge. It was the kind of an amendment, I will say, that ought to have been discussed by the Committee on Military Affairs of this House, because it is subject to a point of order. I am in sympathy with some of the argument made by the gentlemen who oppose it, but I think when this goes to the Senate they will redraft the amendment so that the discharge that will be given to these boys will state the facts in the discharge, the kind of a discharge which the Secretary of War, as I understand it, later gave to the conscientious objectors.

As the matter now stands there are many places in the United States where a man of military age can not get work with corporations or individuals unless he can show an honorable discharge; and it is true in many industries that a man who has been in the Army can not get work unless he can show an honorable discharge. Now, if the War Department would simply give the kind of a discharge that would show the facts, so that the employer would know that this 17-year-old boy probably had been enticed by some recruiting officer to enter the service, all difficulty would be obviated. I hope the motion will not prevail to strike this out of the bill.

Mr. CRAGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. CRAGO. I do not want to consume the gentleman's time, but I want to call attention to the fact that that is exactly what they are doing with this blue discharge, which contains nothing on it about a dishonorable discharge.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. That is all right, and I am perfectly willing to have the amendment go into the bill and leave out the word "honorably" from the discharge.

Mr. SWINDALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. For a question.

Mr. SWINDALL. I have a letter from a boy under 16 years of age who enlisted in my district—

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I can not yield to the gentleman for a statement of cases with which I am very familiar and that I want to reach.

Mr. SWINDALL. This boy states that they gave him a dishonorable discharge, not the kind that the gentleman from Pennsylvania refers to.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I want to answer the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRAGO] and say I do not think

these boys ought to get a blue ticket. We are all very familiar with the dishonorable discharge, the yellow ticket, and I think the discharge that these boys get who were under age ought to be at least as good as the one given to conscientious objectors. I think it ought to be a discharge on white paper—

Mr. CRAGO. I agree with you.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. A discharge on white paper, just simply stating the fact that the man enlisted, that he was under age, and that under the law which was passed he was entitled to get out. That ought to be done. I can sympathize with the gentleman's viewpoint concerning the sanctity of an oath.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The gentleman spoke about a recruiting sergeant enticing a boy 17 years of age into the Army. If somebody else enticed the same boy to commit murder, the boy would be held responsible and would be hanged.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. That is true—

Mr. WINGO. One of the troubles is that some gentlemen regard the misstatement of a boy's age as a crime similar to murder. Here is a question I want to ask: Do not the gentlemen from South Dakota and the gentleman from Pennsylvania overlook this fact, that while they are familiar with discharges the average man who is employing people thinks of only two kinds of discharge, the one honorable and the other dishonorable, and that it is a stigma on a man if he can not produce an honorable discharge?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The gentleman has asked his question. Now, I want to reply to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE].

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I ask for one minute more.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask that the gentleman have two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the time of the gentleman be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Replying to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE], I can not agree with his statement, which might be construed as a comparison of the boy who is enticed to commit a murder and the boy 15, 16, or 17 years old who is induced to enlist for the service of his country. [Applause.] I do not think the gentleman wants to make that comparison.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I do not. I only want to say that you are asking sympathy for a boy who is guilty of one indiscretion because he is young and immature, and another boy of the same age and immaturity guilty of one even more gross, and one calling for more deliberation, you hang.

Mr. KING. That makes it worse than it was before.

Mr. WINGO. In Arkansas we do not regard murder as a mere youthful indiscretion, but as a serious crime.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. In order to get the spirit of this amendment into law I think it ought to remain in the bill as it is, because it is the only way you can get action at this session of Congress. If you leave it in as it now stands, while I am not in sympathy with all of it, then it will go to the Senate committee, whose chairman knows military law perhaps as well as anyone in this House, and he will work out an amendment that I think all of us can agree on, those who are in favor of this amendment as it stands and those who are opposed to the use of the word "honorable."

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words. I do not take up the time of this House much, but I am so deeply interested in this question that I want to say I think that the House ought to remedy this situation by appropriate legislation.

I appreciate the viewpoint of those who want to put all the responsibility on the immature boy who enters the service, and sometimes makes an affidavit that a mature man would not make. I understand also that there is a law imposing a penalty upon an officer who is a party to a youth making an affidavit that he is 18 years old, and entering the service, when he is under 18. That law never would have been enacted were it not based upon the thought that some recruiting officer might exercise an undue influence and go too far in inducing young boys to enter the service. There is no question that some recruiting officers have gone too far in their desire to swell enlistments, but you should not deal with this question with the idea that a mere youth of 15, 16, or 17 is to be held to the same strict accountability as if he were a mature man. [Applause.] You have got to deal with the heart and the soul of the young man

who is willing to enter the service and desires to enter it before he has reached the age of 18. [Applause.]

He can not enter under 18, except with the written consent of his parents or guardian. Oftentimes he secures that consent. Sometimes he can not secure it and he makes a false affidavit. Understanding and knowing human nature and knowing the desire of the recruiting officer to respond to the desire of the military department to increase the enlistments in the Army, they seek to make a record, and they sometimes are not careful, when they ought to know and do know that the youth is only 15 or 16 years of age, by his appearance, and that he may be over-induced by the recruiting officer, who ought not to be other than most careful. I know and you know by virtue of the law recently enacted allurements have been held out to young men that if they entered the military service they would secure education, and they have enlisted in the service with that idea.

Sometimes these young men have been allured by the attraction that they will secure an education after they enlist and full opportunity will be given therefor.

I have in my hand a letter where the recruiting officer in my district made a speech before a public school, telling the youths that if they would enter the service they would be permitted to go to school and receive an education. I will ask permission, without taking the time to read it now, to put the letter in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended long enough to have the letter read.

Mr. ANTHONY. I am very sorry, but I am obliged to ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is equivalent to an objection.

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting the letter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks to extend his remarks in the Record by inserting the letter. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. I object.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHEMICAL WARFARE SERVICE.

For the purchase, manufacture, and test of chemical warfare gases or other toxic substances, gas masks, or other offensive or defensive materials or appliances required for gas warfare purposes, including all necessary investigations, research, design, experimentation, and operations connected therewith; purchase of chemicals, special scientific and technical apparatus and instruments; construction, maintenance, and repair of plants, buildings, and equipment and the machinery therefor; receiving, storing, and issuing of supplies, comprising police and office duties, rents, tolls, fuel, gasoline, lubricants, paints and oils, rope and cordage, light, water, advertising, stationery, typewriters and adding machines, including their exchange, office furniture, tools, and instruments; for incidental expenses; for civilian employees; for expenses incidental to the organization, training, and equipment of special gas troops not otherwise provided for, including the training of the Army in chemical warfare, both offensive and defensive, together with the necessary field schools, tactical demonstrations, and maneuvers; for current expenses of chemical projectile filling plants and proving grounds, including construction and maintenance of rail transportation, repairs, alterations, accessories, building and repairing butts and targets, clearing and grading ranges, \$1,500,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman in charge of the bill what was the sum recommended by the department for chemical warfare?

Mr. ANTHONY. Four million four hundred and fifty-seven thousand dollars.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The amount in the bill is therefore a considerable reduction. But I asked the question that I might attract the attention of the committee to the very serious consideration of how far the House intends to commit itself to the development and extension of chemical warfare.

Mr. ANTHONY. I think it would be safe to say that our Government has taken every precaution to make adequate preparation for defense through the use of chemical warfare, if necessity requires, and that they are fully abreast of all developments that are going on.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I would infer so much from the bill. I wish to call the attention of the committee as to how men's minds change in a short time. Less than seven years ago the intelligence of the people of the world—the moral conscience of the people of the world—was shocked by the use of poisonous gases. I say the conscience of the world. I will go further and say that all the nations of the world, unless Germany and the United States of America constitute exceptions. I make that observation with deep regret, for in July, 1899, the peace congress at The Hague, 27 nations, including Germany, bound themselves not to use or employ asphyxiating deleterious gases in warfare. The United States, of all the great nations there present, whose moral ascendancy we at least thought was secure

and conceded, took, in my judgment, a degrading view on that question. Our representatives, Andrew D. White, Seth Low, Stanford Newell, Capt. Mahan, and Capt. Crozier, voted against the signature of the United States to the treaty of The Hague forbidding the use of asphyxiating gases.

Now, is it necessary in these days of piping economy to employ \$1,500,000 in asphyxiating gases? Do we need more than what is necessary for experimentation in order to determine what use we may make of such agencies for defensive purposes? For surely the United States does not desire to embark upon a prodigious program of offensive use of asphyxiating gases.

Mr. BLANTON. What about defensive use?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am no military critic, and I do not desire to criticize the American Army, the General Staff, or any other instrumentality of that great organization.

I would do what I could to sustain its prestige. I think this is a period in American history when all of the institutions of our Government should have the cordial and hearty support of the American Congress in order that we may not lose that respect for and confidence in our institutions so essential to their maintenance and efficient operation. But it does seem to me, with all respect, that this is a very large contribution to a particular military agency of doubtful efficacy, but not doubtful in violating almost the last vestige of civilized warfare.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I quite agree with the gentleman's opinion that it is, to use a loose phrase, rather unsportsmanlike to poison men with gases in warfare. But I think there should be coupled with it the idea that we have to meet a thing of that kind with what is produced by the enemy. However, there is a peace-time use for these gases now being developed. If the gentleman has not had it brought to his attention, it may be interesting to know that they are trying it out in its effect on insects and pests of that kind.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But that is not a military use of it.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. No; but, like many other incidental uses, it comes from military pioneering. They are trying it out on rats in old warehouses and on other pests.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I need not assure the gentleman of my respect for any suggestion he advocates on the subject of our military affairs, but I do wish to ask the consideration of the committee as to how far we shall go in an extension of the use of gases, a use against which, I repeat, the entire world held upon its hands in holy horror seven years ago. There was nothing that shocked the moral conscience of the world, the sensibilities of civilization, quite so much as the use by the Germans of gas upon the British and French troops. We all thought it was an inhuman method of warfare and one that violated the accepted code of civilization. I hope America is not estopped from making the criticism by reason of having refused to enter into The Hague agreement not to employ it. It does seem to me, however, that we should not expend so much money in this business as is carried in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WALSH). The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I repeat that \$1,500,000 is a large appropriation for poisonous gases unless we mean to prescribe a policy very offensive and intensive in this sort of warfare. I for one can not permit myself at this time to submit to such extensive use of gas.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes.

Mr. FRENCH. In the early days of the war, when gas was first used, the mortality on the part of those who were overwhelmed with the waves of gas approached from 35 to 50 per cent; but as a result of experimentation in the line, especially of defense, the mortality was reduced to between 1 and 2 per cent, and that was approximately the percentage of loss at the end of the war. It seemed that those figures abundantly justified the very modest appropriation in this bill upon the part of the Government, if for no other reason than to meet the gas attacks in the future.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's observations, but I respectfully submit that we can not dispose of this question by percentages or mathematics. In my judgment it is a moral question, a question as to whether or not we will hold a position of leadership in international ethics or go into a contest for the exercise of all of the instru-

mentalities of war which science may devise and excuse our atrocities by the refinements of the mercy of quick destruction or the permanent disability of human beings. Great, indeed, is barbarism when enforced by science.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Would not the gentleman make a distinction between the use originally of gas by the Germans against those unfamiliar with it and unprotected and the use of gas upon full notice and against those who have quite effective means of defense?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I would make a distinction as between offensive and defensive use of it?

Mr. CRAMTON. Offensive use as a surprise and offensive use against an antagonist similarly armed. There would be a great difference, I think.

Mr. MONTAGUE. For tanks we give \$500,000, for automatic machine guns \$500,000, and yet for poisonous gas we give \$1,500,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. Oh, no; a large part of that is used for defense against gas. It is for masks, and so forth. They are carrying on very extensive investigations to get the most effective masks to meet attacks of gas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the motion to strike out. I do not suppose that anyone is more thoroughly opposed to war than I am, but I have never known such a creature as civilized warfare. I have heard people talk about civilized warfare, but I never have seen an evidence of civilized warfare. When nations engage in war they engage in war for the purpose of killing each other. I am here with no brief to defend our representatives at The Hague for not signing that agreement referred to by the gentleman from Virginia, Gov. MONTAGUE; but I understand those gentlemen said that signing that agreement meant nothing, because if they signed the agreement it would be treated as a scrap of paper when two nations got at war, and as an evidence of the fact that they were right about it Germany did scrap the paper, although she signed the agreement not to use gas. The United States Government is in a position to use more gas and more deadly gas than all of the other nations in the world combined, and while I dislike to contemplate death on the battle field by the rapid-fire gun, where they shoot from 600 to 800 times a minute, mowing down human life, while I dislike to contemplate the air filled with argosies of destruction, yet when my Nation gets into war with any other nation I want my Nation to be in such shape that she can destroy the enemy as rapidly as possible and with as little loss of American life as possible. [Applause.]

Now, it is true that in the very beginning of this gas warfare we were all shocked, but we at once knew that we had to meet it, and we did. But we did more, for we soon developed the most deadly gas in the world. The young gentleman who came before the committee on deficiencies with Army and Navy officers to get the money to manufacture the first gas looked as much like a cherub and an angel as any man I ever saw. He had clear blue eyes, he had rosy cheeks, and as I looked at that young man, 35 years old, who told the Army officers that he could make gas four times as deadly as German gas, and they were asking us for an appropriation for the purpose not only of defense against German gas but for offensive against them, I wondered if that young man, who looked so much like an angel, who had devised a scheme of all schemes that could produce more death with gas than any other man in the world, could have devised this, as it did not harmonize with his face. But I took another thought, that it is perhaps true that with his scientific knowledge, with his kindness, which shone in his glorious face, backed up as it were with a splendid mind, it was to be used to save the lives of American boys and make Germany ashamed and regret the balance of her life that she ever undertook gaseous warfare. But in my judgment, however much we may regret it, it is here to stay. There is no longer the old battle ax; there is no longer the Richard Cour d' Lion of mighty arm. All the wars fought are going to be won or lost along scientific lines. The day of the individual hero is about gone. Wars will be won or lost in the air or under the sea. In my judgment, Gen. Mitchell, by his testimony before this committee, convinced, at least convinced me—maybe because I was easy to be convinced, because I believe in it—I do believe that the future means that the nation that shall control the air will be able to destroy the battleships, will be able to destroy the cities of the country, no matter how remote they be, because I saw the model a few days ago—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SISSON. I ask for five minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SISSON. I saw the model of an aeroplane made of solid metal that proposed to take up 100 passengers, that proposed to go around the world with 12,000 gallons of gasoline and make the trip without stopping. We have just commenced air navigation, and I am unwilling that this appropriation shall be cut lower than this committee cut it. First, because I want us to keep abreast with the world in gas warfare. Second, the problem that is most important now is to devise a gas mask—and our Army officers believe we have it—a gas mask that will be a protection for our soldiers, and I am willing that they shall spend some money to protect the lives of the boys, especially if you expect to conscript them and put them into the war to fight our battles. I have too much love for the life of the American boy to put him into the Army unless he is at least as well equipped and, God help us, better prepared to take care of his own life than the soldiers of the enemy. [Applause.] Now, Gen. Sherman never said anything truer in his life, and we people down South know him. He was that general who was so careless with fire—you all recollect he was a little careless with it—and when he struck us at Chattanooga and went from there to Atlanta and to the sea he did considerable burning, and you will recall that a hue and cry went up through the northern press about the inhumanity of Gen. Sherman making war upon defenseless women and children; you will recall the famous laconic telegram he sent from Georgia—his only answer was when he replied to the communication about how terrible or how hellish his conduct was there—his telegram back to the President of the United States was that "War is hell."

And it is hell, and when we get into war I want America to make it so hellish for the enemy that he will realize he has been through perdition before he gets through with Uncle Sam. [Applause.] Therefore I am unwilling, gentlemen of the committee, that we should take any backward step in this most advanced method of warfare, because we expect to fight the battles of the future not with men but with science, and therefore we have got to be abreast of the times, and the most economical arm of warfare is that developed by gas—

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. SISSON. I will.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If the gentleman wishes to make war more hellish, as the gentleman has suggested most eloquently, would the gentleman subscribe to the poisoning of wells and springs?

Mr. SISSON. No; I would not do that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How can the gentleman get away from his argument if he will not do it?

Mr. SISSON. I do not want women and children who are not combatants to be killed, but if as a matter of fact I could poison a well and none, but the enemy's soldiers drink it, bless your soul, I would poison the well and destroy the enemy's army and save the lives of our own boys. Now, you will say that is cruel, but war is cruel. Human passion when aroused is cruel. The most cruel animal on this earth is the human animal. They have more hatred, they have more vengeance, and the most cruel thing on earth is the cruelty multiplied by the number of units you have in a nation. You take the cruelty of the nation and its cruelty is as multiplied by the cruelty of the number of men engaged in it.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Is it not a fact that the use of gas is the most humane method of fighting?

Mr. SISSON. One of the most humane methods, because, in the first place, if you have gas the death is more certain, quick, and speedy than it is to leave them wounded and bleeding and dying on the battle field.

Mr. DENISON. Now, as another means of making the death more certain, I wonder if the gentleman from Mississippi would approve the use of poisoned bullets so that the wounded would also die?

Mr. SISSON. As a matter of fact, I must confess I have reasoned about it—and I believe I have got a kind heart—and I do not see very much difference in shooting a man with a bullet that is poisoned and one that is not poisoned. We are trying to kill him anyway.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

I do not want to take much time, and I suppose it is needless for me to say that I am opposed to warfare and especially to everything unusually hellish in warfare. But if we were to examine the different means of bringing death in the recent war we would find the use of shells, the use of mines, the use of certain kinds of shrapnel, the use of bullets on the battle

field more disastrous than the use of gas, if we shall omit the very first few months when gas was used by the German armies. If you will examine the casualties at Ypres, and some of the other places where gas was first used, you will find the mortality exceedingly high. The reason it was high was because the British and the French and the Belgian Governments did not know how to meet the gas attacks.

As soon as they did know how they began to scale down the mortality percentage, and after a very few months the percentage of mortality of men put out of commission was reduced far below the percentage of mortality of those who were rendered unable to engage as combatants further by means of bullets or shells or other means of warfare that were employed. The reason why the disaster was so great in the first instance was because those who were fighting against the German Army did not know how to meet the gas attacks. In my judgment, one of the most important problems for our War Department to-day is the problem of working out the means of meeting gas attacks in the future.

Unquestionably what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] said is true, that in the future science will play an important part in world warfare and unquestionably gas will be used. Nothing can be said in defense of using gas upon innocent people in cities and upon noncombatant populations generally, but I believe that gas will be used in the future in meeting, at least, the attacks of one army upon another. That army will be at a disadvantage that does not know how to meet the attack.

There are various kinds of gases. One of the gases, for instance, the lachrymal gas, produces such an irritation of the eyes that the soldiers against whom it is used are not able to pursue their work. Then you have the sneezing gas; you have gases of deadly character, that, unless the soldiers can be protected from them, will cause death, and horrible death, to those who are in the zones that are overflowed by gas waves as they roll across the lines.

One of the great duties of our Government is to work out means of meeting gas attacks of an enemy. We have at this time devised a very satisfactory kind of gas mask; one that can protect the soldier from the lachrymal gas, one that can protect from the sneezing gas; one that contains also a chest, if you please, a canister that can be filled with one kind or another of chemical, that will neutralize the gas that is rolled across the line by the enemy. The gas mask itself may last many years, but the kind of gas that is used determines the kind of chemical that must be placed in the canister that every soldier must carry with him. And it is up to our Government to be abreast of the times and know what gases can be used, what the possibilities of gases may be, and how to meet by the proper kind of chemical within the canister furnished to the soldier the gas that will be used against him. More than that, the soldier must be taught how to handle the gas mask. We are told to-day that many of the masks used in the mines of this country have proven useless as against gases caused in one way or another in the different mines. And why? In part, because the kind of chemical is not in the canister that ought to be there in the particular instance; and, in part, because the average miner does not know how to put the gas mask upon himself to protect him from the gas that may be in the mines. Our soldiers must know something of gas in warfare; they should have masks; they should know how to use masks. The Chemical Warfare Service of the War Department is an important and it is an economical service of the Government. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

It seems to me that the general proposition favored by those who stand for some of the provisions of this bill is that we should advertise to the world that we are preparing for war, and go on preparing up to the hilt. Somebody has said that in the most tumultuous days of French history, in the latter part of the eighteenth century, France was a government of emotion tempered by epigrams. We seem to be carrying on a government of emotion, with the epigrams absent.

Prior to the war our military policy was based upon the theory that war was improbable. Our policy now seems to be based upon the probability that war is liable to occur at any moment. I believe that is a mistaken conception forecast. That mistake is the thing that leads gentlemen like my friend from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] to advocate a magnitude and method of preparation that prior to the World War, and under less excited conditions than now prevail, would be resisted by nearly everybody. If the logic of the gentleman has any strength, there is no limit at which we should stop in our preparation activities. If that is the attitude of the United

States, of course, we may as well proclaim the fact and let it be understood that we are not sympathetic with the desire to reduce armaments and to save this and other nations from the enormous burdens incident to building up and maintaining great military establishments.

Mr. PELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. In just a moment. The logic of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] goes, for instance, to this point: If he is right, we should not shy off from universal military training. No line can be drawn between the necessity, if the necessity exists, for several of the activities proposed by this bill, and the necessity for making even more complete preparation by drawing all the young men of the country into the same sort of military training that has been so common on the other side of the water. While on that point, I rejoice that the minority party here on a certain day in 1919 met in caucus and proclaimed to the House and the country that it was against the policy of general military training, whether compulsory or voluntary. That action served to stem, in a way, the rising tide of an undesirable sentiment. I hope that the minority, acting concertedly and vigorously in the next Congress, will confront all the champions of militarism with a well-defined policy of antimilitarism. The minority can render no service of more real and lasting value to the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. HUSTED rose.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more, in order that I may yield and reply to the two gentlemen from New York [Mr. HUSTED and Mr. PELL]?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks for two minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUSTED. I do not at all agree with the views of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] as to the justification for the poisoning of wells. But I should like to ask the gentleman from Virginia if the use of gas in warfare, the legitimate use, is not to put men out of action rather than to kill them or to permanently injure them, and if under present defensive means with the use of modern gas masks that is not the general result, and if in accomplishing that general result we are not advocating a rather humane means of warfare instead of a cruel or inhuman means?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. From what I know of the subject, no such distinction can be taken. The ultimate purpose is to destroy. The provision in question with reference to gases to be used in conducting warfare, of course, contemplates the discovery of gases of the most effective and deadly character.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired. All time has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREYS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Mississippi rise?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. To strike out the necessary number of words to gain the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that there are already two motions to strike out words.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I am opposed to striking those words out. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the time allowed for debate on this paragraph on each side is exhausted.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. TILSON). The gentleman from Mississippi moves to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make a few remarks about the use of gas. When gas was first used in the recent war the whole world was more or less shocked with what we thought was the horror of it. Perhaps there were several reasons for that, and the first probably was that it was because the enemy had used it, and so in accordance with the usual propaganda it was denounced as inhuman and outrageous. The fact is the sin which Germany committed was not in using the gas itself, but because she had agreed with the nations that she would not use poison gas; and it is interesting to note that when that proposition was made the representatives of the United States refused to commit the United States to that policy, and so it happened that the United States refused to agree not to use poison gas.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. When was this agreement supposed to be made?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Several years before the war broke out in Europe.

Mr. MONTAGUE. In July of 1890, at The Hague.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. That was at The Hague Convention.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am asking for information.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes; it was at The Hague Convention, and the representative of the United States, Capt. Mahan, refused to go into the agreement.

As the war progressed the use of gas became general, and after the war was over we were able to assemble the facts as they developed, and they show that one-third of the battle casualties in the American Army were caused by gas, and less than 4 per cent of the deaths were caused by gas, and also that a smaller proportion of the soldiers who were put out of commission by gas were less permanently injured than of those that were put out of commission by the other offensive means of warfare, with shrapnel, bullets, and so forth. And so it appears that gas is not only the most effective weapon in war but the most humane. It puts the enemy out of commission, yet kills a less percentage of his men than any other means known.

For that reason, despite all that had been said about the use of gas in war, when we came to reorganize our Army after the war we provided for the continuance and for the further development of the Chemical Warfare Service, which is charged with the responsibility and the duty of studying all the various methods of applying this destructive weapon.

Mr. PELL and Mr. MONTAGUE rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I will yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does the gentleman state the fact without qualification?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Do I state what fact without qualification?

Mr. MONTAGUE. That gas has been less injurious than the other means of destruction.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. The record shows that about one-third, speaking approximately, of our battle casualties were from gas, and only 4 per cent of our deaths were from gas, and that a smaller proportion of the gas casualties resulted in permanent disability than the casualties by bullets, and so forth.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I suppose the gentleman understands that statistics are not always reliable?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Have we reached the point where we can ascertain the fact that the gentleman seems to think is certain—namely, do we yet know how far gas has destroyed the life or impaired the health of the soldiers of the country? Have we reached the peak? Is not the testimony now to the effect that we must have more hospitals and more asylums for the treatment of soldiers injured by gas? That gas is frequently obscure and slow in disclosing its injuries to the bodies of our soldiers?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. The peak of what may be called the consequential disabilities among our soldiers has not yet been reached, but that is not confined to gas cases; it embraces the disabilities caused by all other forms of casualty.

Mr. HUSTED. And is there not always a possibility that if we continue the study of this subject, we may discover a gas which will put the enemy out of commission without inflicting any permanently injurious effect upon the men?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. That may be possible; but we must go by the facts that have already been developed, and these facts are up to date, not prospective, not speculative, that gas is the most humane instrumentality of warfare that was developed by the recent war. Now, let me quote the hearings; and I invite your attention particularly to what is said about tuberculosis being induced by gas. I read from the hearings, page 1091:

CASUALTIES FROM GAS IN THE LATE WAR.

Mr. SLEMP. And did not Germany shock, you might say, the moral sense of the world when she began to use gas?

Gen. FRIES. Yes, sir. There were two reasons for that. In the first place, she agreed not to use it and broke her word. In the second place, the first gas to be used was used against absolutely unprotected troops who knew nothing about it, so that the death rate there was probably 25 per cent of everybody that was gassed, because they had

no protection. Now, that death rate fell from that time down until it reached the low point where just barely 2 per cent of the men that got gassed died; and of those who were wounded—and that was pretty nearly one-third of our casualties in the war—of those wounded only about 2,600 had any disability when they were discharged from the Army.

In other words, only about 4 per cent had any disability at all as against practically 12 per cent for bullets and high explosives, with an additional 3½ per cent of soldiers in the hospitals from other causes. Thus the death rate was about one-twelfth what it was from bullets and high explosives. This low death rate comes about because the men knew how to protect themselves. Protection could not prevent the casualties; they remained high and the men were put out of action from but two to four months. And another thing, the recent statistics of the Surgeon General's Office show that there is apparently no tuberculosis caused by gas—in fact, the statistics of this last year are very interesting; tuberculosis rates in all gas cases in France in 1918 and 1919 was only 2.45 per thousand, but in 1918 among all the men in France wounded and well it was 3.6 per thousand; and in 1919 that went up to 4.3 per thousand.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion to strike out.

Mr. ANTHONY. I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I should like to offer an amendment to this paragraph, to strike out "\$1,500,000" and insert "\$1,000,000."

Mr. ANTHONY. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have no desire to debate the question at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, nineteen hundred years ago the Galilean brought a new religion, of peace on earth, good will to men. This great country is the foremost of all Christian nations which follow His lead and suggestion. The whole great Christian Continent of Europe is an exemplification and development of Christian civilization.

From the tenor of most of this discussion and of similar discussions on some of these Army and Navy bills every year it would seem that that splendid Christian civilization reached its loftiest culmination when the Kaiser's army marched through Brussels with banners flying, with drums beating, with bugles blowing, with canteens and caissons filled with poison gas, on its way to burn the towns, destroy the orchards, and ruin the farms of inoffensive France. If that was not the loftiest culmination of Christian civilization as now interpreted, I do not know what most of this argument is founded upon.

We have heard it suggested to-day that it is proper to poison the wells of the soldiers of the enemy. We consider the age of chivalry an age of semicivilization, and Japan and China and other barbaric countries have been to us objects of scorn. Yet when we have reached this stage in our boasted Christian civilization this House devotes a very considerable and sometimes the major portion of its time to trying to devise means to destroy everything that Jesus Christ undertook to accomplish. I think it is time we desist from calling ourselves a Christian Nation, and that we entitle this "A bill to destroy Christian civilization and to do away with the doctrines of the Galilean."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. LITTLE. I think we ought to entitle some of these bills "A bill to repeal the Sermon on the Mount and every declaration that emanates from our Sacred Scriptures." This country has many needs more important than that of turning ours into a nation of soldiers. Let us talk of something else besides drums and guns and epitaphs.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. I have not the time. I am not a member of any church. I do not rise to that lofty altitude—I wish I could—where I would feel confident that I could live up to those great doctrines. But I do feel that a great Christian country, at a time when its heel is upon the neck of the world, if it wants to have it there, at a time when the greatest empire Europe ever had, reached the greatest period of armament that any nation ever reached, and then took the most terrific licking that any nation ever got, largely at the hands of a Republic which had not even begun to spit on its hands to get ready when this war began, it is time that we begin to learn to have a little ordinary common sense and to quit talking about wasting millions and wasting men in getting ready to fight a world no nation of which wants to fight us. When our greatest war

ended our greatest soldier, U. S. Grant, sent our soldiers home never dreaming of asking for millions of men and money to prepare for another war, but said "Let us have peace." It is time that we begin to be Christians and to live up to Christian doctrines, or else quit talking about them. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] seem to concur in urging that we should make no preparations whatever for the national defense.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The gentleman is under an entire misapprehension; I think we ought to observe the rule of reason in this matter.

Mr. DEMPSEY. It seems to me that the gentleman's argument inevitably leads to the conclusion that we should make no preparations in that direction, in spite of his present declaration.

Let us see what the situation is. In order to meet the requirements of the World War we armed and equipped millions of men and sent them abroad. We had an annual expenditure for military purposes reaching into billions of dollars. This bill proposes to appropriate for only 150,000 men and to expend in the aggregate the sum of \$331,000,000. What more can the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] ask? Is not that coming down from the peak of war at the end of so short a time as this, as rapidly as any man can reasonably ask, be he a pacifist or be he whatever he may be, or whatever may be his views upon the military question? Is not that coming down as rapidly as he could ask anyone to come down?

Now, let us take the specific item under discussion. In view of experience—because that is the surest guide—we must assume that gas is going to be used in future wars. Is there, then, anyone among us who would urge, in view of the well-known fact that gas will be used by our enemies in any conflict into which we may be precipitated in the future, that the United States should discard gas, should cease to use it, should cease to prepare to use it, should be in a state of woeful unpreparedness to meet that most formidable agency? I do not believe any gentleman will urge that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It may be interesting to gentlemen to know that there is now in the United States the German, Beyer, who invented the poisonous gases used by the Germans in the war and developed the machinery for their use, and he now comes to the United States and gets in here without a visé on his passport by putting up a small bond.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Let me say, in answer to the gentleman from Virginia, Congress in both branches passed a resolution limiting the Army, which a short time ago embraced millions of men, to 175,000 men. Congress by this bill proposes to limit the Army to 150,000 men, and the gentleman from Virginia says he wants the energetic minority to make history and show what a minority can do. I call the attention of the gentleman from Virginia to the fact that apparently his minority, however active it may be, is not united, because just as we are discussing the question word comes to us that the President has vetoed the resolution for an Army of 175,000 men. So you are at discord; you are not united; it is not a militant minority; it is a minority divided against itself; its views are discordant and its views are unsettled. So, gentlemen, I say that the single question we are discussing is, Will we discard gas on the certainty that our foes will use it; and if we are going to use gas, is not this amount reasonable and modest?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I have offered an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 59, line 22, strike out "\$1,500,000" and insert "\$1,000,000."

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important subject and I think we had better have a quorum here. I make the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MONTAGUE) there were 13 ayes and 25 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL GUARD.

ARMING, EQUIPPING, AND TRAINING THE NATIONAL GUARD.

For purchase of animals for mounted units, \$100.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. I want to ask the chairman for some explanation. We have been appropriating money in the millions, and succeeding items call for various large sums, and here is an appropriation that seems to be utterly indefensible.

Mr. ANTHONY. The War Department asked for \$2,000,000 for the purchase of animals for the National Guard, but the committee decided that it was not wise to equip the National Guard with animals, and so cut this down to \$100, so that we could maintain the language in the bill.

Mr. DENISON. How many animals is it intended to buy with this \$100?

Mr. ANTHONY. We do not intend to buy any; we do this simply to keep the language in the bill. The gentleman knows that it is very much harder to get language into a bill than it is to keep it in.

Mr. DENISON. I did not know that.

Mr. CRAGO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Under the heading of "National Guard" I want to make a brief statement, not in criticism of the gentleman from Kansas, who has labored so well in the preparation of this bill, but to correct an injustice that may be done a splendid officer in the service.

On February 1 the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY], in explaining the bill, said:

We have already made such provision. The Committee on Military Affairs last year in its reorganization act provided that the Chief of the Militia Bureau should be a National Guard officer selected by the governors of the States. The War Department has made such appointment of a National Guard officer, but I am very sorry to say they did not listen to the recommendations of the governors of the States.

That statement of the gentleman from Kansas is an answer to a question by the gentleman from Texas—if there was not some way by which we could change the sympathy of the War Department toward the National Guard. In justice to the department and also to the distinguished officer of the National Guard who was appointed Chief of the Militia Bureau, Col George C. Rickards, of Pennsylvania, I want to put in the RECORD the exact language of the act providing for the appointment of this officer. It is as follows:

The Militia Division of the War Department shall hereafter be known as the Militia Bureau of the War Department. After January 1, 1921, the Chief of the Militia Bureau shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, by selection from lists of present and former National Guard officers recommended by the governors of the several States and Territories as suitable for such appointment, who hold commissions in the Officers' Reserve Corps, who have had 10 or more years' commissioned service in the National Guard, at least 5 of which has been in the line, and who have attained at least the grade of major.

The President, under authority given by this statute, did appoint the gentleman I have named, and this officer is a member of the Officers' Reserve Corps; he has had more than 10 years' commissioned service in the National Guard and has served through these years of service as an officer of the line, and he attained the grade, I believe, of brigadier general in the World War, although he was in command of a regiment most of the time. He was recommended by a number of the governors of the different States.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAGO. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Does not the gentleman believe that from the words he has just quoted—

recommended by the governors of the several States and Territories—it was intended that the President should consult with the governors of the States and Territories as to the man who should be placed in that position?

Mr. CRAGO. I would not take that from the language of the act—one man might be recommended by 3 governors, another by 10, and another by 12. I think the act contemplates that the attention of the President shall be called by the governor of a State to the man he regards as one who has the qualifications for this position.

Mr. ANTHONY. I have not the slightest desire to reflect upon the man from Pennsylvania who was appointed in that position.

Mr. CRAGO. I realize that.

Mr. ANTHONY. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the governors of 34 States and Territories, in conformity with the law which the gentleman has just quoted, did agree on one man for that office, and that one man was the choice of the representatives of the National Guard organizations. Yet the President of the United States absolutely ignored the

34 governors and ignored our purpose in the language just quoted.

Mr. CRAGO. I want to state further that practically all of the governors of these States and the adjutants general since this appointment have congratulated the appointee and also the department on the appointment. I desire to say that the man appointed was a gallant officer. I have no doubt that the distinguished officer from the State of Kansas would have well filled this position had he been appointed. I have a personal acquaintance with him and I have a high regard for him. I have no criticism to make of his actions. I merely call attention to the fact that the law had been observed in appointing this man as Chief of the Militia Bureau.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I have no desire to take up the time of the House unnecessarily, but it seems to me that this is a good place to suggest a little something in the way of prophecy. Our old friend Josh Billings said, "Don't profesy unless ye kno." Of course, I can not qualify under that sage admonition, because I am not a seer, but I do say that it is a part of human experience to expect that when we make a law that calls for 48 governors to propose from among their own citizens one man to preside over the military destinies of all men of like condition in the whole 48 States we can look for some politics, we can look for some jealousies, we can look for some disappointments, and we can look for some reaction.

I never favored the idea that the Chief of the Militia Bureau should be a National Guard officer. I have the highest respect for that institution. I served in it in the old days myself, and I have pleasant and tender and grave memories of it, and have nothing in the world but respect for it. But it is human nature to figure that if you get one man from one of the 48 States as Chief of the Militia Bureau he will stay just about long enough for some people in the other 47 States to figure that it is about time to have a change and to have one of their own men put in. Immediately by choosing this man, based on the States' organizations idea, you always put 47 men outside and one man in. You can not avoid it; it is the logic of human experience and circumstance; whereas if you were to have a man who is a professional soldier, who does not do anything else, who hails from any section under the flag to which he happens to have been sent, who has no local environment he may be charged with representing, you would avoid the possibilities of a deal of that mischief.

I believed it was a mistake from a military viewpoint to make this the law, and I believe it will be found to work out as an error of judgment as a matter of policy and as a matter of expediency in government.

The Clerk read as follows:

For transportation of equipment and supplies, \$150,000.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I note that this paragraph has to do with transportation, so that of course the railroads are affected. The amount of it is very trifling, but I am rather surprised that I have not been receiving propaganda in behalf of it. Practically everything that comes into this House that has either a direct or indirect bearing on the railroads is carefully controlled, fostered, discouraged, promoted, or whatever the interests of the railroad may dictate, by an overwhelming propaganda.

I imagine there is no Member of the House who has not been receiving or who has not received to-day letters and telegrams demanding that he support the Winslow bill. Everybody it seems, except Members of Congress, knows that it is proposed to put over the Winslow bill on next Monday on a motion to suspend the rules. The move has been tipped off to all of the selfish interests of the country. They have arrayed themselves, they are marshaled, they are in action. They are bringing pressure to bear upon their Representatives in Congress. The demand is being made that we support the Winslow bill when it is brought forward next Monday.

As in nearly all cases of this kind the propaganda in favor of the Winslow bill is largely based on false premises, largely inspired by misrepresentations, and so forth. If it has any truth back of it at all, it has been discolored, and the people who are writing and telegraphing us are being misled. All of the railroad attorneys, all of the railroad jumping jacks, in the country are demanding that their Representatives vote for this bill. All of the material and supply men are crying out that the Winslow bill must pass so that they can collect the bills for supplies sold the railroads. The truth is that a lot of the railroads, for the deliberate purpose of bringing pressure to bear upon Members of Congress, have refrained from paying their bills when they were able to pay them, and have been telling a lot of lies to the people to whom they owe money for supplies. Many of the railroads that have been making these

representations, that they can not pay their bills, have money in their treasuries and where they have no money they have credit. The truth is that many of the railroads making these representations have already received, under section 209 of the transportation act, large advances and have little more coming to them. They have not only received advances under section 209, but they have borrowed money from the \$300,000,000 revolving fund. There is yet money left in that fund, which these railroads can get if they want to pay their bills—a part of that fund.

The railroads are raising a cry of poverty. It is a false cry; it is not true. Wall Street knows what the facts are. The pleas of poverty have not frightened Wall Street. Railroad stocks and bonds are still selling on a strong market from 5 to 25 per cent higher than they were a year ago. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co. floated a \$50,000,000 bond loan last April at 7 per cent. They are soon to float another loan much larger. How much are they paying? Only 6½ per cent. The financial conditions, so far as the railroad companies are concerned, are better to-day than last year, yet the railroads say they can not pay for coal and lumber, can not pay the bills that they owe. The statement is essentially false. It is made for the purpose of getting the supply people they owe to bring pressure to bear upon their Representatives in Congress and get them to put through this bill as contemplated next Monday afternoon, without having any opportunity for investigation, without any opportunity for real consideration, without any chance to amend, and with only 20 minutes' debate on each side. That is the scheme of the railroads, and that is what they are going to put over.

Perhaps I am giving Members of Congress information by telling you that it is on the cards to put this Winslow bill through next Monday. Does everybody know that? I am fairly wide awake, and I associate with other Members of Congress who are wide awake, and we have talked about these matters. They did not know and I did not know until I began to get this propaganda from these propagandists who expect to get some money out of our Treasury because of that propaganda. I have been informed by men living hundreds of miles away from the Capitol that it is on the cards that this bill is to be put through the House on next Monday afternoon. Yet Members of Congress outside of the Republican steering committee know nothing about it. The selfish interests have been informed by those in control of the House. Other Members of Congress are expected to jump through the hoop like trained spaniels.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized to oppose the pro forma amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention to say anything at this time. I tried to get the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] to yield to a question. I want to say to the gentleman from Alabama it is not now and it never was the intention of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to consider the Winslow bill and try to jam it through the House without consideration.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. ANTHONY. Is the gentleman going to discuss the bill?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I would like to say a few words—

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to ask for the regular order if that is the case.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I ask to be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has been recognized once, and the Chair, exercising his right as a Member of the House, can refuse—

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. May I make a parliamentary inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the Chair recognize me to offer an amendment to this section?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has already offered one amendment.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I offered to strike it out.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, the amendment is still pending.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. But I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment if the Chair is willing to assume that it is technically before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman moves to strike out the paragraph. The Chair was not clear whether or not it was a pro forma amendment.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I will say to the Chair it was a pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the pro forma amendment is pending, and can not be withdrawn without unanimous consent of the committee.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Then let us have a vote on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Strike out "\$150,000" and make it "\$100,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HUDDLESTON moves to amend, page 60, line 21, by striking out "\$150,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$100,000."

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be recognized for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I do not think it is going to break the railroads—

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not talking to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. So far as the gentleman has proceeded, the Chair can not determine.

Mr. BARKLEY. This deals with transportation, and the gentleman mentioned railroads.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. If I can proceed in any way at all, I think I will show that I am in order. I do not think a reduction from \$150,000 to \$100,000 is going to break the railroads. They are not in as bad shape as some may think. At any rate, they are expecting very soon to be in very much better shape because of the passage of the Winslow bill, which is on the cards to be put through the House next Monday afternoon. I would be glad to rely upon the statement of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER] that it is not the purpose to put this bill through under suspension of the rules, if I felt that he was authorized to speak—

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. No; I can not yield.

Mr. COOPER. Just for a question?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. No; I will not yield. I asked the gentleman to yield to me, and he would not do it.

I will be glad to rely on the gentleman's statement if I thought he was authorized on behalf of his committee or on behalf of the leadership of this House to make the statement. But his position, however worthy he may be, is not one of leadership, either of his committee or in the House.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order the gentleman is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The gentleman will take his seat.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BLANTON. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of upholding this bill now before the House, unless there is something radical in it that ought to be taken out. [Laughter.] I do not believe in taking out of this bill by amendment wholesome items that have been carefully inserted by the committee, unfamiliar to the one who offers the amendment. I take it the gentleman in charge of this bill knows more about it than anybody else in the House. We had an example of that here yesterday, when the item of typewriters was under consideration, back on page 25. This item of \$26,108,430 for buying typewriters was involved. And the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] got up here and demanded that the Chair recognize him, and he got mad because the Chair did not do it when somebody else was first on his feet, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER] got up and said the Chair must recognize the gentleman because he was a member of the great Appropriations Committee, intimating that he had something special to offer to save money. And the Chair, upon that assertion, recognized the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD]. What did he do? He did not offer to strike out this \$26,108,430, all of which could be spent in buying typewriters, or the provision to purchase typewriters, on page 25, but he jumped over to the next page of the bill, page 26, where our distinguished chairman, the eminent gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY], in his wisdom had seen fit to limit this appropriation for typewriters to

\$10,000. He jumped over to the next page, page 26, where the wholesome limitation was, and struck out the word "purchase" from the limitation, and now, since this great so-called economical feat was accomplished by the gentleman from Indiana, the War Department, if it saw fit, could spend this whole \$26,108,430 for typewriters. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood] thought he was doing the House and the country and the committee and the chairman a kindness, but he did not know how to do it. He jumped up here half cocked. That was what was the matter.

And the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY], a while ago, just because the President has seen fit to exercise his constitutional prerogative and veto a bill, likewise jumped up and said that because the President vetoed it the Democrats have not got any policy. If we have not got any, what kind have you Republicans got, when your distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee had to get two men from New York to help him get recognition from the Chair? He has arranged this bill so that you could spend \$26,108,430 for typewriters.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LAYTON. The point of order is that the gentleman is not speaking upon this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes; I am speaking on saving money.

Mr. LAYTON. The gentleman is wasting it.

Mr. BLANTON. And therefore I say that I want the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY], the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, to know that I am one of his right-hand bowers. [Laughter.] And I want him to know that he has my help and protection, and whenever some fellow who has not studied the bill gets up and offers an amendment to strike something wholesome out, I am with the gentleman from Kansas to help him protect his bill. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL GUARD.

ARMING, EQUIPPING, AND TRAINING THE NATIONAL GUARD.

- For purchase of animals for mounted units, \$100.
- For procurement of forage, bedding, etc., for animals, \$1,500,000.
- For compensation of help for care of matériel, animals, and equipment, \$1,000,000.
- For expenses, camps of instruction, \$5,500,000.
- For expenses, selected officers and enlisted men, military service schools, \$200,000.
- For pay and allowances, officers, National Guard, detailed with Army, \$150,000.
- For pay of property and disbursing officers for the United States, \$45,000.
- For general expenses, equipment and instruction, National Guard, \$750,000.
- For travel of Federal officers and noncommissioned officers in connection with the National Guard, \$75,000.
- For repair of Federal property issued to the National Guard, \$5,000.
- For transportation of equipment and supplies, \$150,000.
- For expenses, sergeant-instructors, \$50,000.
- For office rent, etc., inspector-instructors, \$9,000.
- For pay of National Guard (armory drills), \$9,500,000.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purposes does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SEARS. To make the point of order that we have not yet voted on the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SEARS. I simply do that because I think it is incumbent upon the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] to reply to the bouquets that have just been handed to him.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is correct, and we return to the question of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ARMS, UNIFORMS, EQUIPMENT, ETC., FOR FIELD SERVICE, NATIONAL GUARD.

To procure by purchase or manufacture and issue from time to time to the National Guard upon requisition of the governors of the several States and Territories, or the commanding general, National Guard of the District of Columbia, such number of United States service arms with all accessories, Field Artillery and Coast Artillery matériel, Engineer, Signal, and sanitary matériel, accouterments, field uniforms, clothing, equipage, publications, and military stores of all kinds, including public animals, and a reserve supply of such arms, matériel, accouterments, field uniforms, clothing, equipage, and military stores of all kinds, as are necessary to arm, uniform, and equip for field service the National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, \$5,000,000: *Provided*, That members of the National Guard who have or shall become entitled for a continuous period of less than one month to Federal pay at the rates fixed for the Regular Army, whether by virtue of a call by the President, of attendance at school or maneuver, or of any other cause, and whose accounts have not yet been settled, shall receive such pay for each day of such period; and the 31st day of a calendar month shall not be

excluded from the computation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War is hereby directed to issue from surplus or reserve stores and matériel now on hand and purchased for the United States Army such articles of clothing and equipment and Field Artillery matériel and ammunition as may be needed by the National Guard organized under the provisions of the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, as amended by the act approved June 4, 1920. This issue shall be made without charge against militia appropriations.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. WALSH. Against what appropriations are these issues made? The concluding language of this paragraph is that the issues "shall be made without charge against militia appropriations." Now, against what appropriations do these issues come?

Mr. ANTHONY. Against the appropriations on page 60.

Mr. WALSH. Are those militia appropriations?

Mr. ANTHONY. Those are militia appropriations; yes.

Mr. WALSH. This language says that they shall be issued without charge against those appropriations?

Mr. ANTHONY. That is the idea. That language is used in the effort to reduce the amount of money appropriations. We provide that if the National Guard needs arms or equipment or uniforms or matériel of that kind which the Regular Army has on hand as reserve, that matériel shall be issued to them without charge from the money herein appropriated. Heretofore the War Department, to augment the appropriations made by Congress, has been charging the National Guard for matériel on hand, issuing it to the guard, and taking it out of the guard appropriation, and respending it for the purposes of the Regular Army. We are trying to economize here and stop that.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Is it not a fact that in the appropriation last year we attempted or endeavored to take care of this very proposition, to have these requisitions filled out of surplus, but the War Department got around the language we had in that appropriation on the ground that it was not surplus? Now, you are trying to reach what they are holding in reserve.

Mr. WALSH. They will get around that, too.

Mr. ANTHONY. I call your attention to the fact that we add the words "or reserve" after the "surplus," so that we could get hold of the immense amounts of matériel that the War Department insists on holding as reserve and refuses to call surplus, although in some branches of the Army they have enough goods on hand to last the Army 10 years, perhaps; but they refuse to include that in the surplus. Now, we have provided that it shall be for the use of the National Guard. It is new legislation, but it will have a very potent effect if it is allowed to stay in.

Mr. WALSH. Who is to determine whether this matériel is surplus or is held in reserve? It is left to the War Department?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Now, assume that they say that this matériel is surplus and not held in reserve, and that they have not any of it that ought to be issued to the guard. Where will the guard get it, and to what appropriations will it be charged?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say to the gentleman that if it is not surplus it must be reserve.

Mr. WALSH. It may be on hand.

Mr. ANTHONY. If it is not in actual use by the troops—

Mr. WALSH. It need not be in actual use. It could be assigned to them and remain in the warehouse.

Mr. ANTHONY. I think it would be reserve.

Mr. WALSH. It will be left to the War Department to determine that?

Mr. ANTHONY. They hold their matériel in two classes—reserve and surplus—unless it is actually in the hands of troops.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman have any information as to how much of this matériel there is? Has any inventory been submitted to the gentleman's committee or to the Committee on Military Affairs of what this matériel is, and where it is, and why it has not been issued before, without legislation from Congress?

Mr. ANTHONY. In every part of the hearings which the committee held you will find the question directed to the officer, "How much matériel have you on hand for which you are asking this money?" For instance, under the head of "Machine guns," that question was asked of the committee, and we showed you that there were 272,000 machine guns held in reserve. Under every heading you will find an ample amount of matériel of war held in reserve.

Mr. WALSH. Is the gentleman satisfied, as chairman of the subcommittee, that the language he has employed here will preclude the department from carrying out the intention of Congress in the manner in which it expects it to be done and not evaded, as was done in the last two years?

Mr. ANTHONY. In the last two years the War Department has evaded the intention of Congress.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman think this language will preclude any evasion?

Mr. ANTHONY. We think it will preclude it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I observe in this morning's Post this statement:

While no agreement is reached, it is the general hope now that in addition to the general appropriation bills, the emergency railroad bill, the hospital bill, the good-roads bill, and perhaps one or two others can be passed before adjournment. The last three named will be taken up in the House on Monday.

That refers to the program of legislation before the House and confirms the statement I made a moment ago that we may expect the Winslow bill to be jammed through here on unanimous-consent day on a motion to suspend the rules on next Monday. Now that is further confirmed by a colloquy that took place between the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] at the closing of the session yesterday afternoon, in which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] asked the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] if it was proposed to take up that bill. I believe he stated to him that he had heard it was to be taken up. Thereupon the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] said that was a matter for the Speaker. Of course, the gentleman from Wyoming knew. He simply did not care to commit himself on the proposition. Had it not been intended to take up the bill, he would have told the gentleman from Texas, because he was himself asking that the hours of the House be changed in order to give more time.

I am receiving this propaganda. They say that the measure is coming up Monday; that statement is coming from the selfish interests of the country—

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order that we now have under discussion in this House the matter of the arming, equipment, and uniforms of the National Guard, and the gentleman is not speaking at all upon that subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum of the committee is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred Members present, a quorum. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CIVILIAN MILITARY TRAINING CAMPS.

For furnishing, at the expense of the United States, to warrant officers, enlisted men, and civilians attending training camps maintained under the provisions of section 47-d of the national defense act of June 3, 1916, as amended by the act of June 4, 1920, uniforms, subsistence, transportation, and medical attendance and supplies, or in lieu of such transportation and of subsistence for travel to and from camps, travel allowances at 5 cents per mile, as prescribed in said section 47-d, \$1,000,000: *Provided*, That the funds herein appropriated shall not be used for the training of any person who is over 45 years of age: *Provided further*, That used or salvaged uniforms and equipment shall be issued so far as available to persons receiving instruction at said camps.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I move to strike out, in line 2, page 63, the word "transportation."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 63, line 2, strike out the word "transportation."

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the railroads will seriously object to not receiving any of the money covered by this paragraph. They are expecting to receive funds out of the Public Treasury as the result of the raid which they contemplate making through the Winslow bill, which is to be brought up next Monday afternoon, I understand.

I should be very glad to believe that that bill will not be brought up here, particularly under a motion to suspend the rules. It would be very unfair to put through that bill by suspension of the rules. It is going to cost the Government two or three hundred million dollars if that bill is put through.

I could demonstrate this, I think, to the reasonable satisfaction of any Member if I had the time to do it.

I am hoping that the gentleman in charge of that bill and those who are in charge of legislation in this House will not permit a measure so fraught with expense to the Government as that is to come up here and be put through practically without debate and without opportunity for amendment.

Mr. WINSLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing his amendment.

Mr. RAYBURN. I think it comes in bad grace from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER] to make that point, because he has already discussed the whole thing himself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is within his rights in making the point of order. The Chair is not able, under any reasonable construction of the rule, to hold that the gentleman from Alabama is debating the paragraph before the House, and therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum of the committee is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will ascertain. [After counting.] Eighty-seven Members present; not a quorum.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise; and on that motion I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas moves that the committee do now rise, and on that motion demands tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. ANTHONY and Mr. HUDDLESTON.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 10, noes 95.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee refuses to rise. A quorum is present. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama to strike out the word "transportation," in line 2, page 63.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment. We will be able to make some time here this afternoon if the question that I asked the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] yesterday is answered. That is whether or not there is going to be a motion made on Monday to suspend the rules and pass what is known as the Winslow bill? I see the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WINSLOW] is here.

Mr. MONDELL. I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing this bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. I agree with the gentleman that I am not discussing the bill, but this is information that I think Members of the House have a right to have.

Mr. SNYDER. Regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is proceeding out of order.

Mr. RAYBURN. I know I am speaking out of order, but I am trying to get a little information that I think the House ought to have. If gentlemen do not want to give it, why, it is their responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

PURCHASE OF ARTICLES MANUFACTURED AT GOVERNMENT ARSENALS.

No part of the moneys appropriated in this act shall be used or expended for the purchase or acquirement of any article or articles that at the time of the proposed acquirement can be manufactured or produced in each or any of the Government arsenals of the United States for a sum less than it can be purchased or procured otherwise.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HULL of Iowa: Page 64, line 13, after the word "otherwise," insert "that no part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work. Nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premium or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and not authorized by law, and I would like to be heard on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly, but it has been passed upon many times.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, every time an appropriation bill of this kind comes up in the House of Representatives some

Member on the floor in an attempt to put a certain class of American citizens on a pedestal—

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the gentleman from Texas is not talking to his point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas will proceed in order.

Mr. BLANTON. Whenever an appropriation bill comes up they have offered just such an amendment as this, and because mistakes have been made in the past, because for years and years a mistake was made making a certain class of individuals believe that they could do things that others could not, the Supreme Court of the United States lately held that all American citizens are alike and have equal rights, regardless of laws we pass exempting classes.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking to his point of order, and I ask the Chair to enforce the rules of the House and put the gentleman in his seat.

Mr. BLANTON. The Chair is with the gentleman from Texas, but he can not hear the gentleman from Texas on account of the noise by the gentleman from Illinois. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, because the House has permitted such class legislation in the past to go upon an appropriation bill is no reason that we should continue on in the error of our ways without stopping it, and I think it is useless to argue a question of this kind to such a distinguished parliamentarian as the gentleman from Connecticut, who now fortunately occupies the chair.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the paragraph to which it is offered. While it may be germane to other parts of the bill it is not germane to this paragraph relating to the purchase of articles manufactured in Government arsenals. There is nothing in that that makes it germane to that particular paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the point of order made by the gentleman from Massachusetts is good as far as this paragraph is concerned.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. It was carried in the bill before in the same paragraph last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has the act of last year before him, and it is carried in that act as a separate paragraph. The Chair sustains the point of order that it is not germane to the paragraph.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer it as a separate paragraph.

The Clerk again reported the amendment, to be inserted on page 64, after line 13, as a separate paragraph.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, because even though it is offered as a new paragraph, under the ruling of the House it must be germane to the preceding paragraph. It is not germane to the preceding paragraph and is legislation on an appropriation bill not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Regardless of what the present occupant of the chair may think of the wisdom of this amendment, it is his duty as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to rule in accordance with the rules of the House and the best precedents made in accord with the rules of the House. This identical amendment has been offered numerous times and ruled upon by numerous able Chairmen who have filled the chair before, and on all occasions, uniformly, so far as the present occupant of the chair now recalls, it has been held that it is a limitation on appropriations made in the act. Therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I want to appeal to you to adopt this amendment in the interest of a better understanding between the workers and the Government. This is a pure limitation, because it limits the number of officers employed in the arsenals. If it was not for this the officers of the arsenals would be increased ten or twenty times. Few men understand what the Taylor system is. No self-respecting workman will work under the Taylor system. I know of no industrial concern in this country that employs it. They tried to introduce it into the arsenal, and where it was introduced it produced inefficiency and increased the overhead expense many, many times by increasing the number of officers.

The proposition is this: A young lieutenant just from West Point with a stop watch in his hand holds it over a young man who is induced by a bonus to increase the production of a certain article. He times every movement. After he is

through with that man he goes to an old employee who has worked in that arsenal 10 or 15 years and who produces a better article, but takes a little longer time. He says to the old employee, "You do not do it right; you start with your left hand," because the other man started with his left hand. The result is that the efficient man leaves the employment of the Government. I want to read to you just a short excerpt from a paper read by C. E. Knoepfel, president of the Association of Efficient Engineers of this country.

This was the association that tried this system and here is what he says in an article published September 27, 1919, in the Scientific American about his own efficiency scheme:

In writings and addresses in the past I have advocated the use of the stop watch. I have used it in my professional work. I have instructed others in its use and have had others use it for me. Some four years ago, however, I began to see evidences of its unpopularity in industry and began to study the entire situation with a view of getting along without it. Since that time the organization of which I am the head has made no use of the stop watch in its regular work of eliminating industrial inefficiency. We see no use for it in the future in so far as we are concerned, for excellent results have been and can be secured without its use.

It is a long article and he winds it up with the following:

It seems to us, who have studied this question for several years past, that by eliminating the stop watch and making a clean-cut separation between inefficiency in management and inefficiency of the workers the way is paved for a better relationship between the workers and the employers and the increasing of industrial efficiency all along the line.

I do not know that it needs any further evidence than that. I want to tell you that if you try to allow Army officers to put it into your arsenals, as I said before, you will simply increase the overhead expense by increasing the number of officers by probably twenty times, and I want to briefly call your attention to another thing. The amendment which I have sent to the desk is the identical same amendment that is in the naval bill which you will approve next week from the same committee of this House. It has been in the Army bill for at least nine years and it has been in the fortifications bill for at least nine years and in the naval bill for that long. It has the approval, as I understand it, of all of the high officials of the Navy and most of the high officials in the Army. For the development of efficiency in our arsenals and in the interest of humanity, I appeal to you all to urge the passage of this amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am happy to find myself in hearty accordance with the committee that framed this bill, in that it did not make this proposed amendment a part of this bill, and I give my hearty support to the chairman in defending this bill against this vicious amendment. What is this amendment? It is to prevent a Government manager or a Government foreman or a Government superintendent from using any kind of watch or surveillance over Government employees to insure efficiency. That is the sole purpose of the amendment. It is to prevent them from forcing efficiency on the part of the employees. It is to keep our Government from having efficiency. It is a union demand. It is a demand that the unions have been making upon the private employers, and they have even brought it into the Government business, and we have been the dupes of them here for years. We Congressmen have been their playthings. Is it not time that we woke up and became men and legislators for the people as a whole and not for one little class of individuals?

I addressed a large meeting of Government employees in Washington here a week ago, a large audience of them. I called their attention to the fact that they were the playthings of the union leaders here in Washington who are constantly exploiting them. I called their attention to the fact that they had 23 different departments in their employees' union affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, and that none of those 23 departments stood for efficiency. I told them that if they would create a twenty-fourth department and make it stand for efficiency in work for the Government, and weed out all inefficient employees, I would vote to double the salary of every efficient employee of the Government, and I would do it in a minute, and in this morning's Washington Post the union leaders, because the audience who heard me stood up 99 per cent of them and indorsed my speech for efficiency—

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment—because most of the employees said that BLANTON's idea of efficiency was a good thing, and that they were going to stand for it and going to demand it, you find in this morning's Washington Post that the union leaders come out and say that BLANTON's speech for efficiency is going to be disregarded, and that they are not going to make

any move for efficiency in Government service. That is exactly what they said this morning and exactly what this amendment means. They are not going to have efficiency in Government service.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. BLANTON. I am sorry I can not yield. I have only five minutes. The Supreme Court of the United States has held that you have no right to do this. The Supreme Court has held that a provision of law which you passed, putting this little class up on a pedestal to itself was against the interest of society. It spanked every Congressman who voted for that measure, and yet you just keep on voting for just such an amendment as this, and why? Are you afraid to vote against it? I know that some of you are not, but you want to take the easiest route, the one of least resistance. It is lots easier to swim with the tide than to go up against it. I am one of those who are willing to swim against the tide, if necessary, in behalf of my country. Are you going to let this pass just because unions have forced you to let it pass heretofore?

Mr. KING. Is the gentleman asking a question?

Mr. BLANTON. Some of these days if you do, you are going to find that some slick-faced, fine-looking young fellow in your district is going to be sent here by the people to take your place. The people are tired of it. It was this truckling of our Government to such class interests that put you Republicans in power, and you know it. The name of Calvin Coolidge was the open sesame into political power for you Republican brothers of ours. That name Calvin Coolidge went as a hurricane from one side of the United States to the other as the man who stood for law and order, who stood for no class legislation, who stood for all of the people of the United States. God bless him! If he had not been a Republican, I would have voted for him myself. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLACK rose.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KING. Has all debate upon the last amendment closed?

The CHAIRMAN. It has under the rule.

Mr. KING. Then I ask for recognition, for I desire to speak in opposition to the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman consults the rule, he will find that a gentleman offering an amendment has five minutes and the gentleman in opposition has five minutes, and that that closes debate on the amendment.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] has risen with an amendment.

Mr. ANTHONY. I ask that my request be submitted for debate to close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas interrupted to prefer a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. ANTHONY. I did not mean to take the gentleman from Texas off his feet.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's request?

Mr. ANTHONY. That all debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto be closed in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman mean the paragraph and all amendments? The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. KING. I object.

Mr. ANTHONY. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. KING. Only a few minutes.

Mr. ANTHONY. The gentleman will have time.

Mr. KING. I will withdraw the objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLACK moves to amend the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] by striking out the words "or other time-measuring device," which occur after the words "stop watch," and by striking out the following language: "Nor shall any part of the appropriation made in this act be available to pay any premium or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages except for suggestions resulting in improvement or economy in the operation of any Government plant," so that the amendment as amended would read:

"No part of the appropriation made by this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government for making or causing to be made with a stop watch a time study of any such employee between the start and the completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work."

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] does three things. First, it prohibits a time study by a stop watch, but it does not stop there, and there is the smoke screen of the thing. In my judgment this stop watch is used as a stalking horse because of the known prejudice against it; and if you will read the amendment it goes further and says, "or other time-measuring device," thereby prohibiting the Government from making any time study of the work that an employee is doing. That provision of the amendment is the principal evil of which I am complaining. Then in addition to that the last proviso prohibits the payment of a premium, bonus, or cash reward to any employee for increased efficiency, thereby allowing the slowest employee to regulate the efficiency of the factory. [Applause.] I do not believe it is fair or just to hold down the employee of superior skill and workmanship and compel him to receive the same pay as the slowest man in the factory. I do not object to the prohibition of the stop watch, although I read the hearings when this proposition was originally up at the time Mr. Tavenner offered it, and if I had time I could show the House that there was not an iota of testimony to support the contention of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] that it was abused by the Government.

But I have no objection to that part of the Hull amendment which prohibits it; but I am not going on record in this House to prevent the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, from making any sort of time study of an employee's job. That is going entirely too far. So my amendment would prevent the use of the stop watch, but would still leave the Government free to make a time study by other methods. A year ago we had on the floor of the House an amendment to increase the appropriation for the Bureau of Yards and Docks in the Navy, and when hearings were being held by the Committee on Naval Affairs some members of the committee said to Assistant Secretary Roosevelt and Admiral Parks, "You are not getting the efficiency out of your employees you ought to; you are in here asking for an increased appropriation. Why do you not get more efficiency?" Here is what Mr. Roosevelt said in reply to that:

Last summer my own personal guess—and that is what you might call it—was that we were somewhere between 65 and 70 per cent efficient. That is, we were turning out per day per man 65 or 70 per cent of what we turned out in 1914.

Some member of the committee asked him this question:

Why do not the officials of the Government make a study of the efficiency of these employees?

And Mr. Roosevelt's answer is as follows:

We do not keep time cards, as we are not allowed to do so by Congress.

[Applause.]

Now, gentlemen, the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] goes a great deal further than prohibiting the use of the stop watch. It absolutely prohibits any time study of an employee's job. I would like to know what justification any Member of this Congress can have in criticizing the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy for inefficiency in the arsenals of the War Department or the navy yards of the Navy when Congress itself has taken a rope and tied it around their hands and said, "You shall not make any time study of a job." [Applause.] And I am not going to vote for an amendment like the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much, indeed, to be forced to arise at this time to enter a protest against the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], but I have sat upon this floor now, lo, these many months, and have heard the laboring people of this country abused by the gentleman from Texas—

Mr. BLACK. What gentleman from Texas?

Mr. KING. It has gone in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the country may believe that we sanction his attacks.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING. Not at all just now, in three minutes. I am sure this Congress does not applaud the sentiments of the gentleman from Texas. I refer to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. I will assume the responsibility.

Mr. KING. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], the leader of the Democracy in this House, has just finished a

vociferous, vicious speech against the laboring people of this country, followed with tremendous applause from the Democratic side of this House. That I regret. There is no use beating around the bush. It is a clear question of whether your sympathies and hearts are with the ordinary man, the man who labors, the man who detests having a stop watch held over him, a stop watch, which is only fit for a race horse, held over him like a convict.

If you have any sympathy in your hearts—and I know the Republicans on this side have, because time after time they have refused to allow the stop-watch system to remain in the law, and the Chairman who is presiding, a good Republican himself, has held this amendment to be strictly in order—you will vote against the stop-watch system. There is no use of discussing it. It is a pure question, and you ought to understand it. It is a fair test of whether you have any sympathy at all with the ordinary man. And as to the statement of the gentleman from Texas as to me personally which he made upon the floor of this House just a moment ago, to the effect that "the gentleman from Illinois" was so blind in his mind that he could not see the points made by the gentleman from Texas, I wish to refer to a little passage from Alexander Pope:

Of all the ills that harass the distressed,
Sure the most bitter is a scornful jest.
Fate never wounds more deep a generous heart
Than when a blockhead's insult points the dart.

[Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman speaking about himself? It partly applies to him.

Mr. KING. I do not yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CARSS. Will the gentleman yield a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE] is recognized.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have listened very attentively to the speeches that have been made in favor of the stop-watch system, and I am frank to say they come from the lips of men who have never seen the stop watch in operation. [Applause.] The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] claps his hands, because he does not know any better. [Laughter.] Coming from a laboring community and a district in which is located one of the great navy yards of this country, I refuse to remain silent while the laboring men of that district are represented as slackers and shirkers in the performance of their duty to their Government. I know what the stop watch is, and I know what the card system is, and I assert that there never has been anything attempted in our governmental departments that has brought more dissatisfaction or caused more harm to the Government than this attempt to build up this so-called hypocritical efficiency board that is operating in every department of this Government merely to make jobs for men who can not work with their hands.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I have said, I have seen the stop watch and card system in operation in the navy yards, and I have seen the men who work in the yards. Has it come to such a pass in this Nation that, after a man has given the best that is in him for 15 or 20 years in the Government service, a stripling of a boy, 20 or 25 years of age, can be brought in and made a standard of service? This is the practice to-day. You may say that it is not so, but I know it is so. Mr. Chairman, the standard is taken from the most active men in the department, and they put the stop watch on the men who made inventions, who did the work for the Government, who lived up to their tasks, and have given the Government the greatest inventions it has to work with to-day.

On account of age and length of service these men slow up in their work, and for this reason they are the first to be discharged. They were the men who were discharged while the stop watch was in operation. When the use of the stop watch was discontinued the service was immediately improved.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. The Secretary of War, at the time he made the report in 1916, said that no man had been discharged by the system in the War Department.

Mr. TAGUE. I do not care what the Secretary has said. I know better. Every day men are being discharged in the navy yards merely to satisfy the whim of some man who sets up the standard and asks men to follow it, when that man could not follow the standard himself. They have thrashed it out, and I have a case in mind now where a man worked in the navy yards for 22 years, a man who gave to the Government many inventions, and labored hard and zealously for his Government. This man had the standard set on him and his efficiency was marked down. And when the furloughs and discharges came in the

navy yard the man who was discharged was the man whose efficiency was marked low, and the young man who had done nothing, except to enter the service for a few months, was given his place. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have not any particular reason for advocating here the cause of the labor unions. In the last congressional campaign their leaders strenuously opposed me in my district, unjust as such action was, and so I do not rise as their advocate here. But I do desire to say that from my experience in talking to the men who labor in the great Rock Island Arsenal, located in my district, I am convinced that this amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] ought to be adopted. I have talked with these men, and I know how they feel about it. I do not believe any man, gentlemen, will work well with a fellow standing behind him with a stop watch. I would not want to do it. There is not a man in this House who would want to do it. It was necessary in the first instance to do something of this kind to stop a practice which was going on in some of the arsenals in the United States. Now, you say that this goes further and prohibits time studies. Perhaps that is so. But I have talked with these men and I have come to the conclusion, from what they tell me and from what I have seen, that more efficient service can be gotten out of them by an ordinary system of employer and employee than there can be by some efficiency or time-card system. This is the principal thing they complain about: During the last war we had about 25,000 men working in the arsenal in my district. They say that if it is permitted the officers of the Army will bring men into their institution, men who are exceptionally fast workers, and they will put them on a job and will measure the work by the work of those men; from that time forward the standards for piecework in that institution are fixed by this man who can work faster than the ordinary man can.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I have not the time. This is not a fair standard, and I have found in my experience that such a system is not productive of a good spirit; that it does not build up a good morale in that institution, and I think we had better keep it out.

Mr. CARSS. Is it not possible for the Government to weed out incompetent and inefficient employees, if any there be, without this system?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Absolutely. There are foremen in these arsenals that have been there for years and years. They know the men better than you and I know each other. If there is a poor man, they know who he is and they can weed him out. They know who the poor men are without the use of a stop-watch system.

Mr. BLANTON. Now will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Those very unions now have a representative in the gallery, holding a stop watch on every Member of this House. [Applause.]

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. That may be so, but they need not hold any on me. They have already done me all the harm they can do. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. They get action, too. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] pretends to be an economist and the watchdog of the Treasury, and yet because he is actuated by a very bitter feeling against men who labor with their hands he opposes this amendment which would be in the interest of real economy in the expenditures of the Government.

Personally I have always been of the belief that it is a mistake to have Army and Navy officers put over the civilian employees of our navy yards and arsenals. If the United States Government is going into the business of manufacturing munitions of war, it ought to do as private employers do—allow a man to start in at the bottom and rise to the top by his efficiency, and have civilian foremen and superintendents who have so risen from the ranks over the other civilian employees. But in our arsenals and navy yards we find Army and Navy officers are put in charge of skilled mechanics with the result that there is constant friction and irritation, and that is one of the reasons why these institutions are inefficient as compared with private plants.

Now, unless this amendment, which has been carried on all these bills heretofore, goes on this bill in the form it has gone on heretofore—because the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] does not help it along the line of economy—you are going to open the door to having a whole lot of addi-

tional officers sent to the arsenals to watch over the civilian employees, and you are bound to have a very large unnecessary overhead expense.

Mr. Chairman, they have an efficiency system in the arsenals and navy yards now. The employees in these plants receive efficiency ratings now, and every day and every week men are discharged because of inefficiency as shown by their ratings. Moreover, for some time a movement has been going on looking to a closer cooperation between the commanding officers of the Government arsenals and the employees. The paragraph in this bill immediately preceding the one that is now proposed provides as follows:

No part of the moneys appropriated in this act shall be used or expended for the purchase or acquirement of any article or articles that at the time of the proposed acquirement can not be manufactured or produced in each or any of the Government arsenals of the United States for a sum less than it can be purchased or procured otherwise—

As a result of this enlightened policy of the Government, all the employees of our Government arsenals are working together to try to manufacture those things as cheaply as they can be manufactured elsewhere, so that the Government will give its contracts to the Government arsenals instead of to outside parties. As a result, we are now developing a healthy feeling of cooperation and a new esprit de corps among the employees of our arsenals. The knowledge that unless the cost of production can be kept down the arsenal will not get the contract, and as a result men will be laid off, is the very best incentive to every employee to do his best work.

It is no time now, Mr. Chairman, in this period of reconstruction, to undo the policy that we have pursued for the last nine years, and to return to the medieval policy of treating our machinists and other civilian employees as mere machines that have no feeling, and as shirkers who can not be trusted and who must be watched every minute by some arrogant and, perhaps, ignorant Army officer who does not know how to deal with men. All progressive and far-seeing employers of labor realize that suspicion and hate must give place to mutual trust and friendly cooperation in the relations between capital and labor. I believe that every man who has studied this problem will agree with me on this proposition.

Mr. Chairman, when I entered this House in 1915 I voted against an amendment of this character. The amendment was adopted, however, and has been carried in every appropriation bill since that time. I am convinced that it is a bad time now to try to restore the Taylor stop-watch system, at least until we shall have had an opportunity to study the results of the new system of cooperation that has been inaugurated and compare them with the results of the old system of distrust and force. I trust the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] will prevail. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, is any more time remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Three minutes remain.

Mr. UPSHAW rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a statement. The reason why the committee did not include in the bill the language submitted in the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa are, in the first place, that it was considered legislation, and, in the second place, we had no evidence of any abuses of the kind enumerated, that exist in the arsenals connected with the Army, or which have existed for years, of that kind, and we did not consider it any more necessary to put that into the bill than we did one such as that the men employed there should not commit murder. In the third place, I have always considered the language as political buncombe. There is no election this year, and the committee did not think it necessary to include it in the bill. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I said the representatives of the unions are in the gallery. The American people are also there with their stop watch, and you had better look out. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. One minute remains, and the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. UPSHAW].

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I favor this amendment, for the simple reason that I am opposed to the American Congress going on record as holding under espionage the men in overalls who were so loyal to this Government during the war, and who should be trusted as the friends of honesty everywhere. [Applause.]

The best-governed schools in this country are the schools that govern themselves on the honor system; and if you keep the

labor of this country on the honor system there is more inspiration to work than if you stand and hold a watch over them like the whip of a taskmaster to keep them at work. The strength of our Government depends on the fullest faith of its citizens. Let us not pass a law here that will picture Uncle Sam with a suspicious scowl upon his face, putting an everlasting question point after the industry, the honesty, and the patriotism of these proven defenders and builders of the safety, the prosperity, and the happiness of the American people. Of course, I would not stand for one whit of dishonesty or inefficiency on the part of Government employees, but I do call for inspiring faith and fellowship for the American workman. If I err in any vote on the floor of this House, I want to err on the side of the man in overalls. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. I ask that the amendment be reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the amendment to the amendment be read. Without objection, the Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLACK moves to amend the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] by striking out the words "or other time-measuring device," which occur after the words "stop watch," and by striking out the following language:

"Nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premium or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant."

So that the amendment as amended will read:

That no part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and the completion thereof or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 26, noes 62.

Accordingly the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 67, noes 27.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of one commandant of cadets (colonel) in addition to his regular pay, \$1,000.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph in lines 4 and 5, in that the use of the word "colonel" after the word "cadets" is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish to be heard in support of his point of order?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Yes, Mr. Chairman. As I recall the circumstances, it was for many years the practice of the War Department, and countenanced in appropriation bills, to send an officer of the Army to the United States Military Academy at West Point, and then to give him, as commandant or superintendent, and sometimes as an instructor, increased pay or rank, to be held by him while temporarily on that service. There was no authority in law for it, but it was the practice and the custom, and it was regarded as one of the advantageous details.

The Chair will bear in mind that in the passage of what is known as the Army reorganization act, approved June 4, 1920, on page 30 of the current print, section 27a, the law was made to read:

Hereafter no detail, rating, or assignment of an officer shall carry advanced rank except as otherwise specifically provided herein.

That is the law of the Military Establishment to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Vermont believe that the carrying of the word "(colonel)" at this point would cause the officer to be a colonel if he were not a colonel already?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. It is intended to give him all the emoluments, perquisites, pay, and every other material advantage of the grade and rank of colonel, the very thing which was sought to be avoided and made impossible hereafter in the language of the Army reorganization act that I have just quoted, and the sum of money carried substantiates my opinion, because it makes it possible to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the gentleman from Vermont does the Army reorganization act repeal the Military Academy act?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. It repeals it, inasmuch as it says this:

Hereafter no detail, rating, or assignment of an officer shall carry advanced rank, except as otherwise specifically provided herein.

And the places otherwise specifically provided are the chiefs of the various arms of the service, who upon being taken from the line to be the chiefs of the various arms are given the grade of major general.

The CHAIRMAN. Referring to the Military Academy act the Chair finds in section 1874 of the statutes, as it appears in the book which is on the Speaker's desk, this language:

The commandant of cadets shall have the pay of a lieutenant colonel.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman claim that that provision has been repealed, or that it is still the law?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Section 52 of the Army reorganization act of June 4, 1920, reads:

That all laws and parts of laws in so far as they are inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman contend that the language—

Hereafter no detail, rating, or assignment of an officer shall carry advanced rank, except as otherwise specifically provided herein—

would prevent the appointment of a lieutenant colonel to this position?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. No. If I get the idea of the Chair correctly, the intention of the law was that thereafter there should be no possibility of a preferred position or assignment to be sought by officers because it carried with it an increased grade or rank and pay, and that men should hereafter be assigned to any special duty in the grade they held.

The CHAIRMAN. Wherein does it appear that this officer receives advanced rank? Does the gentleman know that this officer is not a colonel?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. No; but I do not understand that an appropriation bill bases its provisions upon the identity of the individuals who may carry the law out or to whom it may apply. Its basis is the law for the appropriation itself. If you provide for a colonel the War Department must limit it to an officer of that grade.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I might say for the information of the Chair that this very proposition was one of the most strenuously controverted questions on the conference on the Army reorganization bill. After long discussion and determination we succeeded in writing the law as it is written, and the very purpose was to prevent the detail of military attachés or military observers or any other officer in the Army to a grade higher than that he held in the Regular Establishment. I think any effort or attempt to detail a man to West Point or any other place of a lower grade would be in strict violation of law.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, as suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], this carries on the face of it an extension of the authority of the department to take any man, no matter what grade he may hold, and send him to a post where he will have the emoluments of a colonel. It is designed that no matter what grade in the service he may hold he will be a colonel when he gets there and will get the emoluments and pay.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair reads the act, a lieutenant colonel may fill this position and that shall be his rank. The attempt to place a colonel in this position would seem to be clearly a change of law, because it makes the commandant of cadets a colonel instead of a lieutenant colonel, as provided by law. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language "in addition to his regular pay, \$1,000." In the act quoted by the Chair it states that the commandant of the Military Academy shall have the pay of a lieutenant colonel. This authorizes an appropriation in excess of that.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I think that if that language should be stricken out of the bill, it would mean the entire pay of the commandant of cadets would be \$1,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the language against which the point of order is made is that providing for an addition to the regular pay of the officer.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; he would get his regular pay. This is only \$1,000 in addition. I am only objecting to the additional thousand dollars, which is not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order against the paragraph?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order to the paragraph.

Mr. BEE. A parliamentary inquiry. Would that result in having no commandant of cadets?

The CHAIRMAN. No; that is provided for by law. The commandant of cadets is paid from another appropriation. He is paid out of the regular pay of the Army. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of one professor of ordnance and science of gunnery (lieutenant colonel) in addition to pay as major, \$500.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order to this paragraph.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, the committee concedes the point of order; there is no law or authority for it.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the Chair allow me to make a suggestion? As I understand, my friend the chairman concedes the point of order in these paragraphs which will apply down to and including the paragraph in line 11 and even beyond. Now, I think it is only fair to the House to say that inasmuch as this is the first opportunity to bring this matter to the attention of the House and to point out that here is plainly a contradiction and inconsistency with the Army reorganization act, we ought to take this stand here, no matter if subsequently we find some proper means of legislation to put the matter on a proper basis in law. Here is plainly a contradiction in and an inconsistency with the philosophy of the Army reorganization act, which designed, no matter what might be the service to which the man was appointed, that he must go in the grade he held at the time. If they want a man of a higher grade, then they must take a man in the grade they want.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Yes.

Mr. STEVENSON. Why will not the same rule apply to the master of the sword on the preceding page, who you provide is entitled to the pay and emoluments and allowances of a lieutenant colonel?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That position is an anomalous one. It is not carried in the organization of the Army and has no direct relation to the Military Establishment and no coordination with it.

Mr. BEE. He is not usually an Army officer?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. He is an Army officer in the sense that we have made him one by law, but he is not a part of the tactical organization.

Mr. STEVENSON. I just wanted to find out the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of one professor of law (lieutenant colonel) in addition to pay as major, \$500.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of one professor of practical military engineering (lieutenant colonel) in addition to pay as major, \$500.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Chairman, are all of those provisions the point of order is now being sustained against carried in another part of the bill and the pay provided?

The CHAIRMAN. They are all officers of the Army, and their pay is carried in a regular item for pay of the Army.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of one quartermaster and commissary of cadets and treasurer, in addition to his regular pay, \$600.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word merely to say what ought to be said in justice to the subcommittee preparing this bill. They themselves have not introduced this policy into the bill. They have followed the language and the practice of the House with regard to this bill for many years. My remarks were not meant to be in any criticism of them whatever. I thought this was a good time to point out the place where we ought to stop and then see what, if any, supplementary legislation might be necessary to cure what may be a mischief in this particular.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is it not true that assignment to West Point in these various capacities, irrespective of the increase in rank, is regarded as a very choice assignment?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. It is considered a fine encomium upon an officer's proficiency and merit to be sent to West Point as an instructor of cadets.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is much preferable to being out in Arizona on the border.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I fancy it might be so considered.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of one line officer on duty in quartermaster's department at academy, in addition to his regular pay, \$400.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of one constructing quartermaster, in addition to his regular pay, \$1,000.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For increased pay of seven professors, \$4,200.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on that.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, the increase in pay for seven officers is under the act of May 18, 1920, where we temporarily increased the pay of the officers of the Army. This covers the temporary increase.

Mr. CONNALLY. Why is it particularly carried in this item, when a different part of the bill carries pay of all officers?

Mr. ANTHONY. On page 65 we carried the regular pay for the seven professors, \$26,500. This item just read is for their increased pay under the temporary act, and that is the way all of the items are carried throughout the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withdraw the point of order?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am very much concerned to know whether the Winslow amendment to the transportation act is likely to be acted on next Monday. I observe that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess], who is a member of the Committee on Rules, is in the Hall. I am sure that every Member of the House who is present will be glad to know from him whether we may expect that matter to be brought up under suspension of rules on Monday or by special rule.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and five Members are present, a quorum.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, officers on detached service at the academy, \$20,700.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, the amount ought to be corrected, and I reserve the point of order.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I move that lines 21 and 22 be stricken from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the point of order?

Mr. CONNALLY. I make the point of order that it is not authorized because the items have already been taken out on points of order. It is clearly a résumé, not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not be sure that all of the items that have been stricken out are included in this. It is merely a matter of amendment.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the totals, because they are not correct now.

Mr. CONNALLY. I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANTHONY: Page 66, strike out the language in lines 21 and 22.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to lines 1, 2, and 3, at the top of page 66, and that the same be stricken from the bill. They are no longer necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to return to the top of page for the purpose indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to striking out the lines indicated?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY ACADEMY BAND.

For pay of Military Academy Band:

One master sergeant, at \$88.80 per month, \$1,065.60.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do that for the purpose of propounding an interrogatory to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], the leader of the majority, touching the order of business on next Monday.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that it is in order to propound interrogatories to anyone in connection with a discussion of this bill.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I shall not insist upon the interrogatory if the gentleman does not want to answer it. It is a mere matter of courtesy.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I suggest that the House would appreciate knowing whether the Winslow bill is going to come up on next Monday.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama has risen as he states to propound an interrogatory. The Chair does not know whether it is in order or not until the gentleman has made his inquiry.

Mr. BLANTON. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Is there any particular avenue of approach which we must pursue to reach the gentleman from Wyoming?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a proper parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman from Alabama will proceed in order.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, perhaps my question was lost in the confusion. Of course, I do not press it upon the gentleman from Wyoming. I merely would like to suggest to him that Members of the House, and I believe the country at large, would like very much to know whether we may expect to take up the Winslow bill on Monday by a special rule brought in from the Committee on Rules or by a motion to suspend the rules.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking to the matter under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The gentleman from Alabama will take his seat, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Nine sergeants, at \$54 each per month, \$5,832.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am very anxious, Mr. Chairman, to get some information which, I believe, would be very agreeable to the House and I am sure would be of interest to Members of the House and also—

Mr. LAYTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. In a moment.

Mr. LAYTON. I only want to ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I will yield in a moment. And which I am sure will be of great interest to the people of the country since it involves an expenditure and a loss to the Government, as I apprehend, of two or three hundred million dollars—

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order the gentleman is not speaking to his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The gentleman will proceed, if at all, in order.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman is violating the rules of the House. If the gentleman will wait and let us get through with this bill, we are going to try and override a presidential veto. Will the gentleman join us?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The gentleman is not speeding his bill by refusing the information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Twenty-one corporals, at \$44.40 each per month, \$11,188.80.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Since I was not permitted to ask the question of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] or the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess], I would like to know whether there is anybody on the Republican side who knows whether this bill is coming up—

Mr. LAYTON. Will the gentleman let me ask him one question?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I want to ask some questions myself. Mr. LAYTON. It is in the gentleman's interest.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I do not want anything done in my interest. I want something done in the public interest, and that is why I want to get this information. My opposition is based on the fact that something is going to be done that will affect the public interest.

Mr. McARTHUR. I make the point of order that this discussion is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be in order. The gentleman will take his seat. He is out of order.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Regular order!

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not think anybody made the point of order on me.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order was made and sustained.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the Chair inform me who made the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I did not understand him to rise this time. I could not see him if he got up.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

One first sergeant, at \$63.60 per month, \$763.20.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Is there any way in a parliamentary manner that a Member of this House can propound an inquiry to the leaders of the House and of the majority so as to get any idea as to what the order of business will be on Monday next?

The CHAIRMAN. There is no parliamentary way during the discussion of this bill. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Army bill. Nothing else can be properly considered. Anything else is extraneous. Therefore there is no parliamentary way by which the gentleman may propound his inquiry except by unanimous consent.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the Chair to section 3070, on page 148, volume 4, of Hinds' Precedents, House of Representatives, which reads as follows:

Privileged questions often interrupt the regular order of business, but when they are disposed of continues on from the point of interruption.

I submit that the gentleman from Alabama is propounding a perfectly privileged question in asking as to the order of business.

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The quotation from Hinds' Precedents cited by the gentleman from Texas has no possible application to the consideration of a bill in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

One first sergeant, at \$63.60 per month, \$763.20.

Forty-seven sergeants, at \$54 each per month, \$30,456.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I observe the chairman of the Committee on Rules is in the Hall, and I would ask of him—

Mr. McARTHUR. I make the point of order the gentleman is not discussing the matter under consideration.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will he not, for the benefit of Members of the House, tell us what the order of business will be on next Monday?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The gentleman is out of order and will take his seat, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I have admired the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] and I am sure he will give us the information—

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the matter at issue.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum of the committee is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama makes the point that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and five Members are present, a quorum.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, Engineer detachment, \$58,296.80.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Surely, there is some kind-hearted man—

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order the gentleman is not discussing the matter at issue before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon makes the point of order that the discussion is not in order. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BEE. To make a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BEE. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] said he was sure there were kind-hearted men in this House, and the gentleman from Oregon made a point of order against it.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

One first sergeant, at \$63.60 per month, \$763.20.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I will.

Mr. BARKLEY. On the 3d of January the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH], the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, introduced a resolution—

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against all this.

Mr. BARKLEY. He said he could not ascertain the information—

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, is there any method of getting away from this cuckoo-clock statesmanship?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Any gentleman on the Republican side who had the brains of a cuckoo could find out what it is proposed to do next Monday.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole is here for the purpose of observing as well as enforcing the rules of the House, both of which duties he is attempting to perform. The Chair can not determine in advance for what purpose a gentleman rises or what motion he intends to make, and therefore must hear the gentleman far enough to determine in each case whether or not he is transgressing the rules.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

It appears to me that this House in proceeding to appropriate for an Army of 150,000 men is proceeding in the dark, because the information that just came to this House is to the effect that the Chief Executive, President Wilson, has vetoed the resolution whereby the Army was to be reduced to 175,000 men. Whatever action this House may take on this bill, unless the veto of the President of the United States shall be overridden, will be work thrown away.

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the discussion of the gentleman from Mississippi.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman seems to be discussing the general character of the bill, and has not progressed far enough for the Chair to be certain.

Mr. WALSH. Has the President vetoed this bill?

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. I will yield.

Mr. MONDELL. I want to assure the gentleman that if the filibuster being conducted by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] ceases we shall vote on the President's veto of our attempt to reduce the size of the Army this evening. Some of the gentlemen on the Democratic side, some of the militarists over there, are conducting a filibuster in order to prevent us from doing that.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN] will proceed in order.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, I think that what I am saying is germane, because of the fact that we are considering at this moment a bill that carries an appropriation for an Army of 150,000 men. And as stated by me the other day, it seems paradoxical when the resolution itself carries 175,000 men and we

are appropriating for 150,000 men. A great many of us want an Army of only 150,000 men, and news comes through the President's veto that we are not to have even the number of 175,000, but 280,000 according to the President's desire. It occurs to me that the people of the United States at this very moment know that in this country, with 4,000,000 young men trained for military duty, with all these cantonments that have been constructed, with all the ammunition and guns piled up over this Republic, 150,000 men in the Regular Establishment, with the National Guard in every State of this Union, are ample for the safety of the Republic.

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is not discussing the paragraph now under consideration. The paragraph under consideration—

Mr. QUIN. I will discuss the paragraph—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi will desist until the Chair has replied. The paragraph under consideration is in line 6, page 71:

One first sergeant—

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will desist until the Chair has finished.

The item is:

One first sergeant, at \$63.00 per month, \$763.20.

That is the paragraph before the House for consideration. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN] will proceed in order.

Mr. QUIN. Sixty-three dollars and sixty cents, of course, is a very small item, but how will \$63.00 amount to anything if you are going to have an Army above 175,000 men? What will these few sergeants amount to that are included here in this item? And the munificent sum of \$63.00, as set out in the item that the Chair says I must discuss, can amount to very little with an Army of 150,000 men. That is a question of expense that I want to impress upon this House at this stage of taxation, with all the burdens of every kind and of every description resting on the taxpayers of this Republic. The American Congress owes a solemn duty to them, and there might be a solemn referendum, if you please, on this House going above an appropriation for an Army of a size that will be oppressive to the people of this country.

This House ought to override the President's veto message.

The time has now come when every section of the United States is looking to the American Congress to give it relief. Some people are calling on us to take off the excess-profits tax. Some are calling on us to take off the tariff tax. Some are calling on us to reduce the income tax. Here we are, by the refusal of the Executive branch of the Government to accept the 175,000 army, called upon to proceed with a program of increasing appropriations which will not only prevent and preclude and inhibit the Congress from taking off any taxes, but will add to the burdens already borne by our long-suffering people. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama rises in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I am strong for economy myself, and it is with great hesitation and reluctance that I oppose the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN], which would result in the saving of \$763.20 during the next fiscal year.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw that. That was just a pro forma amendment. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi to withdraw his pro forma amendment?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama objects.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I think the false economy of the gentleman from Mississippi needs to be exposed. [Laughter.] While I have the kindest feelings for him personally and the highest regard for his judgment, I still feel it my duty to oppose his motion.

What is the use of saving \$763.20 on a couple of sergeants when on Monday next we are going to toss away \$300,000,000 to the railroads of the country? And we are going to toss it away with no more debate than we are giving to this item.

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the discussion of the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed to discuss the amendment under consideration.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, it is foolish to strain at a gnat and swallow a camel. The camel is what I object to. [Laughter.] The camel is what the man who stands for real economy ought to object to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the gentleman refer to the chairman of the Committee on Rules? [Laughter.]

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I most assuredly do not refer to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL]. I need not say that he has a much better chance to get to heaven than the camel has of going through the eye of a needle. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I protest that the gentleman is filibustering. The gentleman from Alabama is conducting a filibuster. The gentleman is not discussing the matter pending before the committee.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is "Campbellflagging." [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The last point of order made by the gentleman is sustained.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. What is it?

The CHAIRMAN. That the gentleman is not discussing the matter pending before the committee.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the Chairman allow me to proceed in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has admonished the gentleman a number of times that he is violating the rule.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] More than 100 Members are present. A quorum is clearly present.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WINGO. Whatever was the contention of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON], he was making an argument such as we frequently make as an illustration. Certainly the Chair does not want to establish such a precedent here.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas would scarcely contend that the gentleman from Alabama was confining himself to the bill.

Mr. WINGO. The point I was making was this, that he was saying that there was no use in cutting out this item. The Chair might not inquire into the ultimate intention of the gentleman. The only thing to do is to decide on the letter. The gentleman used that as an illustration of the fact that it was no good to try to save \$763.20 if you are going to throw away more.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has tried to observe the rule faithfully, and he believes that he has done it. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, Coast Artillery detachment, \$20,988.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I observe that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] is in the Hall.

Mr. McARTHUR. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman far enough to see whether he discusses the amendment or not.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. And I have no doubt that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] knows what is going to happen next Monday.

Mr. McARTHUR. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MISCELLANEOUS.

Travel allowance due enlisted men on discharge, \$5,000.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the fact that I think a correction should be made in lines 13 and 14, "Nine specialists, fifth class, at \$8 each per month, \$864."

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is filibustering and delaying.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. WINGO. We have already passed that item. You can not go back.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman made the point of order that the gentleman was filibustering. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WINGO. I make the point of order that you can not go back.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair repeats that he sustains the point of order.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. WINGO. I would ask the chairman of the committee what information has he got that there is a necessity for this travel allowance for enlisted men on discharge? Is that going to be sufficient—\$5,000—if you are going to discharge all these men?

Mr. ANTHONY. That is the amount of money used each year for the number of men stationed there.

Mr. WINGO. This does not include those who are going to be discharged in order to reduce the Army?

Mr. ANTHONY. No. This covers the detachments regularly stationed at West Point, and this provides the average amount of money.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. BARBOUR. Is there a provision for the travel allowance of candidates for appointment at West Point Military Academy who pass the mental test and are ordered to go to West Point to take the physical examination, and then for some slight physical defect are rejected? Have they to pay their own expenses or are they paid out of this?

Mr. ANTHONY. My impression is that no cadet receives the pay or allowance until he is formally accepted as a cadet.

Mr. BARBOUR. That being the case, he would have to pay his own expenses.

Mr. ANTHONY. That is my impression.
Mr. SMITH of Idaho. But they are not required to go to West Point for this examination.

Mr. ANTHONY. No; they are examined at places near their homes, as a general rule.

Mr. BARBOUR. A case was recently called to my attention where a cadet was ordered to report clear across the continent at West Point, after having been examined at the Presidio at San Francisco, as I understand, and when he arrived at West Point he was rejected for some slight defect in his eyesight, and it cost him something like \$600 for his journey. It would seem to me that this was unjust, and that some provision should be made for either examining and accepting cadets near their homes or else paying their traveling expenses.

Mr. ANTHONY. They are usually examined near their homes; and I would think that if that cadet was ordered to travel, he was entitled to travel pay.

Mr. CURRY of California. The cadets are examined at Army posts near their homes, if they wish to be, but that examination is not final. It is simply a test to see whether or not they are likely to be accepted when they arrive either at Annapolis or at West Point. If they are rejected by the medical examiner at West Point or at Annapolis, they are required to pay their own traveling expenses to and from the academy. I do not know whether there is any objection to that, but that is the status of the case.

Mr. BARBOUR. Does not the gentleman think that is a hardship to those who live so far away as the Pacific coast to have to pay their own traveling expenses to the East?

Mr. CURRY of California. It is undoubtedly a hardship, but that has always been the procedure.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of one staff sergeant, \$975.00: *Provided*, That the noncommissioned officer on duty under the direction of the personnel adjutant shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of that grade while performing the duty as clerk of the personnel adjutant.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order to the proviso in lines 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15, page 72, on the ground that it is not authorized by law. It is a provision for creating an additional officer other than is authorized by the Army reorganization act.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas wish to be heard on the point of order? It appears to the Chair to be legislation, unless the gentleman can point out some specific law authorizing it.

Mr. ANTHONY. It is legislation, but it is presumed that, under the direct authority given to operate the academy, the academy shall have the necessary force with which to carry on the work there. This is to give them the necessary force to do the work.

The CHAIRMAN. The language of the proviso, however, goes further than that. It says that the noncommissioned officer on duty under the direction of the personnel adjutant shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a staff sergeant while performing the duty as clerk to the personnel adjutant. It seems to the Chair that the proviso goes further than the simple assignment of a noncommissioned officer to a certain duty, and undertakes to authorize certain rank, pay, and allowances for that noncommissioned officer while performing the duty of a clerk. Unless there is some specific provision of law the Chair feels constrained to sustain the point of order.

Mr. ANTHONY. The only thing that is out of order is the proviso, however.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all that the point of order is made against. The Chair sustains the point of order to the proviso. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:
For pay of two expert civilian instructors in fencing, broadsword exercises, and other military gymnastics as may be required to perfect this part of the training of cadets, \$3,000.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:
Amendment by Mr. HUDDLESTON: Page 73, line 21, after the word "in," strike out the word "fencing."

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, there is something distasteful to me about the word "fencing." I do not know about the military application of the word, but in its civil application it is objectionable. It carries the significance of insincerity, indirection, and evasiveness. When a Member of the House asks for information which Members of the House ought to have and are entitled to have, and when he asks it of those who have the information and who are charged with the responsibility of giving out the information and they do not give it, but some other persons backing them up in their conspiracy of silence make points of order which cut off the proper interrogation, I hardly know what it amounts to, unless it be "fencing." I am sorry that the majority leader will not tell us what is going to happen on next Monday with reference to the Winslow bill.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is doing what he has been doing for an hour and a half—

Mr. BLANTON. That is not a proper point of order. I make that point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains that point of order. Does the gentleman from Delaware make a point of order?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama will desist until this point of order is settled.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Can not the Chair get somebody to make a point of order?

Mr. LAYTON. I reckon I can make it.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. You do not make it.

Mr. LAYTON. I make the point of order that the gentleman is discussing a matter that is entirely foreign to his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. It is clear that the gentleman is not discussing the matter of his amendment. Therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I may be excused for calling it fencing when the leaders of the House refuse to give this information.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of two expert assistant civilian instructors in military gymnastics, fencing, boxing, wrestling, and swimming, \$4,000: *Provided*, That these civilian instructors employed in the department of modern languages and the department of tactics shall be entitled to public quarters and to the same allowances with respect to fuel and light as those of a first lieutenant when occupying public quarters.

Mr. WINGO. I make a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas will state his point of order.

Mr. WINGO. I make a point of order on the proviso, on the ground that it is legislation not authorized by existing law and is contrary to the express provisions of the Army reorganization act.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas makes the point of order against the proviso.

Mr. WINGO. Here is the legislation: It proposes to give the emolument to the officers and civilian employees, which is unauthorized by the present Army law and is certainly not authorized for the dancing masters.

Mr. ANTHONY. I understand the gentleman makes the point of order that this provision is in conflict with the Army reorganization act.

Mr. WINGO. It is not in conflict. It is not authorized.

Mr. ANTHONY. It is language that has been carried from year to year in the Military Academy bill and is a necessary provision to take care of these instructors.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of one custodian of gymnasium, \$1,200.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Page 74, line 13, strike out the word "custodian."

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I imagine one of the things taught in this gymnasium is fencing, and I can not encourage the teaching of that kind of a thing. Indirectly it is evasion, lack of candor, lack of giving a man who calls for it what he is entitled to have, and certainly it is not a thing that we ought to teach in any gymnasium.

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Yes.

Mr. KING. The gentleman is not directing his remarks against political fencing in any way?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I would say that, in my judgment, the worst fencing the majority ever tried is to put over the Winslow bill next Monday by suspension of the rules.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of two oilers for power plant, \$1,440.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the word "oilers."

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 74, line 21, strike out the word "oilers."

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. Has that amendment been reduced to writing so that the Clerk can properly report it at the desk?

The CHAIRMAN. It has not been reduced to writing.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I ask the Chair that the amendment be reduced to writing.

Mr. WINGO. I make the point of order that the gentleman's point of order comes too late. The gentleman has not used his usual agility and watchfulness at the right time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains that point of order.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, the only notice I had was that there was an amendment offered and the Clerk read one word; there has been no physical sign of the amendment going to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont understands that it is customary in the House, and has been for a great number of years, that when there is an amendment containing a few words to allow it to be presented and not reduce it to writing.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I quite concede that, but I suggest that when an abuse of the rules is in progress we ought to have an opportunity to insist on the rule.

Mr. WINGO. It is too late; debate has already begun.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment has been prepared in form and is on the Clerk's desk. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, oilers are very necessary for every power plant. I am sure I do not want to detract anything from the power plant over there by taking away the oilers. The trouble is often due to the fact that no qualifications for the oilers are prescribed. Are they to be good oilers or bad oilers; what kind of oil are they to use? Every machine needs oil and an oiler.

A machine that has not an oiler that will enable it to receive the oil in such a way as to function is in great danger. A machine composed of men needs lubrication, needs oiling, but it needs such oiling as will produce results, and the best way to produce results out of any machine is to understand what is sought by it—what purpose it is trying to perform.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. In just a moment.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I thought the gentleman was developing a hot box himself.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Let us take, for example, such a machine as the steering committee of this House, or the majority leader of this House, who refuses to give information to the Democratic side of the House and to the people of the country what is going to happen to the Winslow bill on next Monday. That machine surely needs oiling.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk proceeded to read as follows:

For pay of one draftsman in the department of civil and military engineering, \$1,200.

For pay of mechanic and attendant skilled in the technical preparation necessary to chemical and electrical lectures and to the instruction in mineralogy and geology, \$1,200.

Mr. HUDDLESTON (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I desire to offer to lines 22 and 23 on page 74.

The Clerk concluded the reading.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk was engaged in reading the paragraph while the gentleman rose.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The Clerk proceeded to read the next paragraph after I had called the attention of the Chair to the fact that I had an amendment to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk had started to read the paragraph before the gentleman rose to address the Chair.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk informs the Chair that that is the fact.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact that is not the fact. The Clerk may think so, but it is not the fact.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will take the word of the Clerk. The Chair has found him always reliable.

Mr. SISSON. I know he is reliable, and I know that he is one of the best reading clerks we have ever had, but I think he is mistaken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thought the gentleman should wait until he had finished the reading of the paragraph.

Mr. SISSON. The trouble is that he was then on his feet.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman does not lose any of his rights.

Mr. SISSON. Oh, that is all right, then.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the preceding paragraph, which I send to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will have the Clerk report the amendment. The Chair simply wished to have the Clerk finish the reading of the paragraph in the reading of which he was engaged.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. HUDDLESTON: Page 74, line 22, after the word "one," strike out the word "draftsman."

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not understand just exactly what the uses of this draftsman are, and therefore I feel like eliminating him unless I can get some further information. What does he draw? Does he draw plans and specifications or does he draw bills?

Mr. WINGO. He draws salary.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. For instance, such as the Winslow bill, which, it is said, is going to be passed on next Monday.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. It is clear that the gentleman is not proceeding to discuss the amendment before the committee, and any gentleman of the committee has the right to make the point of order. The Chair sustains the point of order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to get some information respecting lines 24 and 25 on page 74 and lines 1 and 2 on page 75. That item is for pay of mechanic and attendant skilled in the technical preparation necessary to chemical and electrical lectures, and to instruction in mineralogy and geology, and the pay is \$1,200. Does the gentleman mean to tell the committee that they have a mechanic teaching mineralogy to these cadets?

Mr. ANTHONY. That is quite evident from the reading of the bill.

Mr. WINGO. It is also evident that they will not be able to get a capable instructor to teach mineralogy for \$1,200 a year.

Mr. ANTHONY. This mechanic is an attendant.

Mr. WINGO. I know; but he also has to be skilled in mineralogy. Is there not some error about that?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think not. He has to prepare the experiments and assist in the technical preparation of the instructor. I think he is more of an assistant than an instructor.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman thinks he is more of what might be called a scholastic valet to the instructor.

Mr. ANTHONY. I would call him a laboratory attendant.

Mr. WINGO. And the gentleman assures the House that they have been able to get a man skilled in mineralogy for that money?

Mr. ANTHONY. I understand that is the case.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I understand that is the case.

Mr. WINGO. Well, it aroused both my suspicion and my curiosity, and that is the reason I inquired about it. I will withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of chapel organist and choirmaster, \$1,500.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 75, line 12, after the word "chapel," strike out the word "organist."

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment very largely to get information from the gentleman from Kansas, the chairman of this committee, in regard to the word "organist." I am sure the boys of the academy need the softening influence of music. Generally an organist plays on an organ as a musical instrument, but I do not know whether this organist is going to play on a musical instrument or whether he is going to play on some other kind of an organ—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is not proceeding in order, and the Chair calls him to order directly.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the Chair to Rule V—

That no dilatory motion shall be entertained by the Speaker.

It is clear to the committee that every motion made by the gentleman is for a dilatory purpose.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield? If the gentleman will tell me what is going to be done with the Winslow bill, I will be satisfied, and he will hear no dilatory motions—

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Regular order!

Mr. HUDDLESTON. But I demand to know that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of one mechanic and attendant skilled in the operation necessary for the preparation of lectures and of material in the department of drawing, to be appointed by the superintendent, \$720.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 76, line 7, after the word "of," strike out the word "lectures."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that under the rules of the House the Chair could not entertain this motion, as it is dilatory.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, in the entire history of the Congress I never heard of a ruling made ruling out an amendment on the ground that it was dilatory. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order of the gentleman from Illinois.

The occupant of the chair has the same rights as the other Members of the House. When, in the opinion of the Chair, a Member is proceeding out of order the Chairman has the same right as any other Member to call him to order. For that reason a few moments ago the Chair did call the gentleman from Alabama to order when sure that he was not discussing the subject matter of the amendment.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the Chair—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. There is no purpose, no dilatory purpose in any amendment I have offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not accused the gentleman of being dilatory in offering amendments.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Nor is there any dilatory purpose in any discussion I have carried on, and I do not want to delay this bill. I want to see the bill adopted, I would like to see it adopted to-night, I want to facilitate the passage of the bill, but, Mr. Chairman, this is not the only bill in Congress. There are other bills, and some of them are of more importance than this bill, and—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not care to hear the gentleman.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I think I am entitled to get some information as to what is to be done with the Winslow bill on next Monday.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to debate that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, the question is whether we will allow some employee of the academy to prepare lectures for the department of drawing. Lecturing is a very important function, and the proposal to pay only \$720 for a whole year for the preparation of lectures is certainly most inadequate. Why, a Member of Congress when he leaves the House sometimes takes the lecture platform and makes that much a night, and here we propose only to give \$720 for a whole year's work. I want to say that no man who is fit to lecture can be found to lecture for \$720, particularly when he is lecturing on the subject of drafting, because drafting is one of the most important of all the arts and one of the most difficult.

It is hard to draw a bill for Congress, not to speak of drawing a picture. And many men who attempt to draw bills do not succeed in doing what they intend. I have in mind that the gentlemen who drew the Winslow bill—

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. HUDDLESTON (continuing). Knew exactly what they were doing.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana will state the point of order.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. That the gentleman is not discussing the amendment before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of one skilled copyist, confidential stenographer, librarian, typewriter, and attendant in the department of mathematics, to be appointed by the Superintendent of the United States Military Academy, \$1,000.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. HUDDLESTON: Page 7, line 1, after the word "copyist," strike out "confidential stenographer."

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I see no reason why there should be a confidential stenographer appointed by the Superintendent of the United States Military Academy. He is transacting the public business. Where is there any room for confidence? He has no right to know anything that the public does not know. He has no right to know anything that a Member of Congress does not know, just as the leader of the majority has no right to know when this Winslow bill is coming up without telling all the Members of the House when it is coming up.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order that the gentleman from Alabama is not discussing the amendment before the committee. The Chair sustains the point of order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For fuel and apparatus, namely: Coal, wood, etc., \$70,000, of which \$10,000 shall be immediately available.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the provision which makes the \$10,000 immediately available, as it is a change of existing law.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the point of order will lie, because it is within the power of the Appropriation Committee to report deficiencies, and they can report them on any bill.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. That belongs in the urgent deficiency bill. They can not put it in this one.

The CHAIRMAN. Can the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] cite any authority to the Chair?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, there can be no doubt that it is within the power of the Committee on Appropriations to report deficiencies, and I believe the Chair will find the rulings to sustain the position I take. And I maintain it is not necessary to report a deficiency only on a deficiency bill. If the committee itself having jurisdiction over appropriations has a

right to report deficiencies, it is not necessary to bring them in a deficiency bill. They can report them on any bill they have a right to bring in.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order. I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. HUDDLESTON: Page 78, line 5, after the word "namely," strike out the word "Coal."

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for the purpose of calling attention to the utter inadequacy of the appropriation. Coal is high, very high—

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I cite the Chair to page 135 of Jefferson's Manual, where is found the following language:

No one is to speak impertinently or beside the question, superfluous, or tediously.

I make the point of order the gentleman comes within the last description. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair feels quite sympathetic with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], but is compelled to overrule the point of order.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The gentleman considers my discussion tedious because I am trying to get information out of him which he has but does not want to give.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order the gentleman is not in order. He admits he is trying to get something in the nature of information that is not before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order. The Chair will attempt to enforce the rules.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I am far from admitting that anything I have to say on this subject would be tedious; far from it.

Coal is high, as I said, and the coal operators of the country have only made a net of three or four dollars a ton on the coal they have sold for the past 12 months, and they are unable to extend any further credits.

I happen to know that that is the situation because of some hearings that I read the other day. A gentleman appeared before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and made a very pitiful plea.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. The gentleman from Alabama has stated that he is endeavoring to get information in regard to the Winslow bill.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Oh, no; not now, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Under paragraph 7, of Rule XVI, "no motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment." I make the point of order on the amendment of the gentleman and the gentleman's speech in its favor.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I am not now seeking that information. I have sought it, but I have not got it.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Indiana state his point of order?

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. The point of order is that under color of amendment the gentleman is seeking to raise a question of the Winslow bill this afternoon on an amendment to this bill. I want to argue that.

The CHAIRMAN. When the gentleman from Alabama violates the rule the Chair will call him to order, whether the point of order is made by the gentleman from Indiana or any other Member.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Section 7, of Rule XVI, provides against seeking to discuss under color of amendment a subject other than the subject under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Indiana will permit the Chair, the Chair would say that the gentleman is discussing an amendment to strike out the word "coal" from this bill.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. The gentleman has stated that he was trying to get information on the Winslow bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I make the point of order that the gentleman from Indiana is aiding the filibuster. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is inclined to believe that the gentleman from Missouri states the fact, and the Chair over-

rules the point of order made by the gentleman from Indiana. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, I was very much impressed with the desperate situation of the coal operators when I read some hearings the other day. They are going to have to charge more than \$70,000—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is not discussing in good faith the amendment to strike out part of this paragraph.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I say that the amount is inadequate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is out of order. The gentleman will take his seat. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For material for hurdles, etc., riding hall, \$600.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUDDLESTON: Page 79, line 12, strike out the word "hurdles."

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I beg the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] to inform me—

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. In just a moment. Of what material are these hurdles made? [Laughter.]

Mr. ANTHONY. I would say that they are made of the same material as the heads of some statesmen. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I hope the gentleman is not making a confession to the House. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. But if he is making a confession, and assuming that he is, I know that he means wood. [Laughter.]

Now, that is not the kind of thing I had in my mind as a hurdle. I had in my mind that there was some obstacle of a more fragile nature, such as furze, or bushes, or something of that kind, or smoke, a sham, a bluff, something like the rules that permit the bringing in of a motion to suspend the rules and pass a bill, as will occur next Monday on the Winslow bill, which will cost the country \$300,000,000.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For department of military hygiene, \$500.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HUDDLESTON offers the following amendment: Page 81, line 8, strike out the paragraph.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, of course, I am ignorant of what is meant by the expression "military hygiene," as distinguished from civil hygiene, if there is such a thing as the latter. I had it in my mind that Hygeia was the goddess of health, and that there can be no particular distinction between military health and civil health. Of course, there are other kinds of health than mere physical health, but I assume that this bill does not aim at providing instruction relating to that kind. Now, for illustration, Mr. Chairman, health is the most splendid thing in the world, and we ought to do everything we can to preserve the health of our boys; but there is a mental health as well as a physical health, and there is not a state of mental health when information that the House is entitled to is withheld from it by its responsible leaders. I refer to the Winslow bill—

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For painting, two coats, walls, doors, and ceilings of rooms, third floor, cadet hospital, kitchen, dining room, hallway, and three squad rooms, \$600.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the chairman if for the sake of good English we ought not to modify the language

in line 1, page 83, where it says "for painting, two coats, walls, doors, and ceilings of rooms"?

Mr. ANTHONY. That is the usual language.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That the funds herein appropriated for the Military Academy may be expended without advertising when, in the opinion of the responsible disbursing officer and the superintendent, it is most economical and advantageous to the Government to dispense with advertising: *Provided further*, That the constructing quartermaster, United States Military Academy, is hereby exempted from all laws and regulations relative to granting leaves of absence to employees with pay while employed on construction work at the Military Academy.

Mr. WALSH. I reserve a point of order against the second proviso. Is this proviso put in the bill in the interest of economy?

Mr. ANTHONY. Both provisions are put on in the interest of economy, especially the last proviso. I am informed that where the authorities at West Point undertake construction work and hire day laborers, say, for 30 days, they come under the statute which requires that United States employees be given vacations with full pay during the period of their employment.

Mr. WALSH. When the officers themselves hire men?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; and that is the reason we want the exemption.

Mr. WALSH. Can they get the kind of labor that will work under these exemptions?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; the quartermaster says he has no trouble at all in getting the labor, but where the men have demanded these vacations they have been allowed them. It looks rather ridiculous for the quartermaster to hire a laborer for 15 days, and then let him obtain 15 days' leave with full pay.

Mr. WALSH. In view of the gentleman's statement, I withdraw the point of order, but do not let Sam Gompers hear about it or we will have trouble.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order to the first proviso on page 87. I think we should not allow these funds to be expended without advertising.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. McCLINTIC. I reserve it.

Mr. GOOD. Did the gentleman hear what the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] stated about the work that is being done on the West Point Military Academy?

Mr. McCLINTIC. I understood the gentleman from Kansas to make that statement in reference to the second proviso.

Mr. ANTHONY. The law now requires that even for small purchases there must be the usual advertising for bids; and the committee felt that in the case of small purchases it was economy to dispense with the advertising.

Mr. McCLINTIC. In reply to the gentleman I will say that I think the rules and regulations have been too lax relative to the expenditure of money in the War Department, and I do not believe we ought to give them this privilege. For that reason I make the point of order against the first paragraph on page 87.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the word "further," in line 6, page 87, be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the word "further" will be stricken out.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAGO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 15 of the bill for the purpose of offering an amendment to an amendment which was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to return to page 15 to offer an amendment to an amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. I object.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with amendments to the House, with a recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the committee rose and the Speaker resumed the chair.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. Does not the gentleman wish to allow the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to make his report?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. No; I make the point now.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama makes the point that no quorum is present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seventy-one Members present, not a quorum.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were ordered to be closed, the Sergeant at Arms to notify absentees, and the Clerk to call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Andrews, Md.	Edmonds	James, Mich.	Radcliffe
Ashbrook	Ellsworth	Johnson, Ky.	Rainey, Ala.
Babka	Elston	Johnston, N. Y.	Rainey, Henry T.
Bacharach	Emerson	Jones, Tex.	Rainey, John W.
Baer	Evans, Mont.	Kendall	Randall, Calif.
Bell	Ferris	Kennedy, Iowa	Ransley
Blackmon	Fish	Kincheloe	Reed, W. Va.
Bland, Mo.	Flood	Kitchin	Riddick
Bowers	Focht	Kreider	Riordan
Brinson	Fordney	Leshner	Robinson, N. C.
Britten	Frear	Linthicum	Rose
Brumbaugh	Gallagher	Lonegan	Rowan
Burke	Gandy	Lufkin	Rowe
Burrroughs	Ganly	McCulloch	Sabath
Caldwell	Gard	McDuffie	Sanders, Ind.
Candler	Glynn	McGlennon	Sanford
Cantrill	Godwin, N. C.	McKiniry	Scully
Carew	Goldfogle	McLane	Sells
Carter	Goodall	Maher	Small
Casey	Goodwin, Ark.	Major	Smith, N. Y.
Chindblom	Gould	Mann, Ill.	Steele
Clark, Fla.	Graham, Pa.	Mann, S. C.	Stephens, Miss.
Classon	Griffin	Mason	Stiness
Cooper	Hamil	Mays	Strong, Pa.
Costello	Hamilton	Mead	Sullivan
Cullen	Harrison	Merritt	Vare
Currie, Mich.	Haugen	Milligan	Volk
Davey	Hayden	Moon	Watson
Dent	Hersey	Mooney	Welling
Dewalt	Hersman	Morin	Whaley
Dominick	Hoey	Mudd	Wilson, Ill.
Dooling	Holland	Nelson, Wis.	Wilson, La.
Doremus	Hull, Tenn.	Patterson	Wise
Drewry	Hutchinson	Perlman	
Eagle	Jacoway	Porter	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and eighty-nine Members have answered to their names; a quorum.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 15943) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, has directed me to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Hull amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse. The question is on agreeing to the other amendments.

The other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL], on which the gentleman from Texas demands a separate vote.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 64, after line 13, insert as a separate paragraph the following: "That no part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device, a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and the completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work, nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash rewards to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas demands the yeas and nays. As many as are in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Five Members have risen, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are denied. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 177, noes 47.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. When will it be in order to demand the reading of the engrossed bill?

The SPEAKER. After the engrossment and third reading of the bill has been ordered. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I demand the reading of the engrossed bill.

The SPEAKER. The engrossed bill is not present at the Clerk's desk and can not be read at this time.

LIMITING SIZE OF UNITED STATES ARMY—VETO MESSAGE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, House joint resolution No. 440, directing the Secretary of War to cease enlisting men in the Regular Army of the United States, except in the cases of those men who have already served one or more enlistments therein.

The text of the joint resolution discloses that its purpose is to cause a discontinuance of enlistment in the Regular Army until the number of enlisted men shall not exceed one hundred and seventy-five thousand. No provision is made in the resolution for the preservation of any proportionate strength in the combatant corps of the Army and a mere discontinuance of enlistment would, for a long time, preserve the Staff Corps disproportionately enlisted and the combatant corps insufficiently manned to maintain the instruction and training which ought to be assured if an Army of one hundred and seventy-five thousand men is to be efficient in proportion to its aggregate number.

On the fourth day of June, 1920, I signed a bill passed by the present Congress, providing for the reorganization of the Army. Because of the profoundly disturbed condition of the world and in order that full benefit might accrue to the people of the United States from the lessons of the world war as to what, under modern conditions, is required to be the nucleus of an efficient Army, the War Department had recommended an Army of approximately five hundred thousand men. The Congress, after prolonged consideration, determined to authorize, and did authorize, the reorganization of the Army on the basis of an enlisted strength of approximately two hundred and eighty thousand men, including in the organization new arms like the Air Service and the Chemical Warfare Service, the use of which were developments of the war and provision for which is a necessary addition to the prewar strength of the Army. The act authorized for the first time in our history a tactical organization of the Army, resting upon divisions as tactical units, and required the training of the National Guard and the organized reserve in territorial areas of the United States in association with the divisions of the Regular Army. At that time the Congress plainly regarded the provision then made as the minimum which would provide for the added arms and new duties imposed on the Army, and for that efficiency which the peace-time Army of the United States should have as the nucleus of mobilization in the event of a national emergency. I regret that I am not able to see in the condition of the world at large or in the needs of the United States any such change as would justify the restriction upon that minimum which is proposed by the House joint resolution.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
5 February, 1921.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House on reconsideration agree to pass the joint resolution, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to propound a parliamentary inquiry. The previous question having been ordered on the Army appropriation bill, and Monday, February 7, 1921, being suspension day, will the vote come on the Army appropriation bill on Monday or not?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not wish to bind himself by his decision, but his present opinion is that it will not. Monday is a special day.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, we have listened with interest to the President's message. It does not seem to me that the President has presented any arguments that have not already been considered by the House. No new questions are raised, no new arguments are presented. It seems, therefore, that there is no necessity for further discussion, and that the House is ready to vote. I therefore move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas, that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken and the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passing the joint resolution, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 271, nays 10, answered "present" 1, not voting 141, as follows:

YEAS—271.

Ackerman	Fess	McClintic	Sherwood
Almon	Fields	McDuffie	Shreve
Anderson	Foster	McFadden	Siegel
Andrews, Nebr.	Freeman	McKenzie	Sinclair
Anthony	French	McKeown	Sinnot
Aswell	Fuller	McKinley	Sisson
Ayres	Gallivan	McLaughlin, Mich.	Slemp
Bankhead	Garner	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Smith, Idaho
Barbour	Good	McLeod	Smith, Ill.
Barkley	Goodykoontz	McPherson	Smith, Mich.
Begg	Graham, Ill.	MacGregor	Smithwick
Benham	Green, Iowa.	Madden	Snell
Benson	Greene, Mass.	Magee	Snyder
Black	Greene, Vt.	Mansfield	Stegall
Bland, Ind.	Griest	Mapes	Stedman
Blaunt	Hadley	Martin	Steenerson
Boies	Hardy, Colo.	Michener	Stephens, Miss.
Bowling	Hardy, Tex.	Miller	Stephens, Ohio
Box	Harrell	Monahan, Wis.	Stevenson
Brand	Hastings	Mondell	Stoll
Briggs	Haugen	Montague	Strong, Kans.
Brinson	Hawley	Moore, Ohio	Summers, Wash.
Brooks, Ill.	Hays	Moore, Va.	Summers, Tex.
Brooks, Pa.	Hernandez	Moore, Ind.	Sweet
Brown	Hickey	Mott	Swindall
Buchanan	Hicks	Murphy	Swope
Burdick	Hoch	Neely	Taylor, Ark.
Butler	Holland	Nelson, Mo.	Taylor, Colo.
Byrnes, S. C.	Houghton	Newton, Minn.	Taylor, Tenn.
Byrns, Tenn.	Howard	Newton, Mo.	Temple
Campbell, Kans.	Huddleston	Nicholls	Thomas
Cannon	Hudspeth	O'Connell	Thompson
Caraway	Hulings	O'Connor	Tillman
Carss	Hull, Iowa.	Ogden	Tilson
Christopherson	Humphreys	Oldfield	Timberlake
Clark, Mo.	Husted	Oliver	Tincher
Cole	Ireland	Olney	Tinkham
Collier	James, Va.	Osborne	Towner
Connally	Jeffers	Overstreet	Treadway
Cooper	Johnson, Miss.	Paige	Upshaw
Copley	Johnson, S. Dak.	Park	Vaile
Craig	Johnson, Wash.	Parker	Venable
Cramton	Jones, Pa.	Parrish	Vestal
Crisp	Juhl	Peters	Vinson
Crowther	Kearns	Phelan	Voigt
Curry, Calif.	Keller	Purnell	Voistead
Dale	Kelley, Mich.	Quin	Walsh
Dallinger	Kelly, Pa.	Ramsey	Walters
Darrow	Kennedy, R. I.	Ramseyer	Ward
Davis, Minn.	King	Randall, Wis.	Wason
Davis, Tenn.	Kinkaid	Rayburn	Watkins
Dempsey	Klecza	Reavis	Webster
Denison	Knutson	Reber	Welty
Dickinson, Mo.	Kraus	Reed, N. Y.	Wheeler
Dickinson, Iowa	Lampert	Rhodes	White, Kans.
Donevan	Langley	Ricketts	White, Me.
Doughton	Lanham	Robison, Ky.	Williams
Dowell	Lankford	Rodenberg	Wilson, Pa.
Drane	Larsen	Rogers	Wingo
Dunbar	Layton	Ronjue	Wimslow
Dunn	Lazaro	Rouse	Wood, Ind.
Dupré	Lea, Calif.	Ruby	Woods, Va.
Dyer	Lehibach	Rucker	Woodyard
Echols	Little	Sanders, La.	Wright
Elliott	Longworth	Sanders, N. Y.	Yates
Esch	Luce	Schall	Young, N. Dak.
Evans, Nebr.	Luhring	Scott	Young, Tex.
Fairfield	McArthur	Sears	

NAYS—10.

Bee	Coady	McAndrews	Sims
Bland, Va.	Eagan	Minahan, N. J.	Tague
Campbell, Pa.	Fisher	Pell	Weaver
Cleary	Igoe	Raker	Welling

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Lee, Ga.

NOT VOTING—141.

Andrews, Md.	Cullen	Gandy	James, Mich.
Ashbrook	Currie, Mich.	Ganly	Johnson, Ky.
Babka	Davey	Gard	Johnston, N. Y.
Bacharach	Dent	Garrett	Jones, Tex.
Baer	Dewalt	Glynn	Kahn
Bell	Dominick	Godwin, N. C.	Kendall
Blackmon	Dooling	Goldfogie	Kennedy, Iowa
Bland, Mo.	Doremus	Goodall	Kettner
Bowers	Drewry	Goodwin, Ark.	Kless
Britten	Eagle	Gould	Kincheloe
Brumbaugh	Edmonds	Graham, Pa.	Kitchin
Burke	Ellsworth	Griffin	Kreider
Burrroughs	Elston	Hamill	Leshner
Caldwell	Emerson	Hamilton	Linthicum
Candler	Evans, Mont.	Harrison	Loneragan
Cantrill	Evans, Nev.	Hayden	Lufkin
Carew	Ferris	Hersey	McCulloch
Carter	Fish	Herzman	McGlennon
Casey	Flood	Hill	McKinley
Chidblem	Focht	Hoey	McLane
Clark, Fla.	Fordney	Hull, Tenn.	Maher
Classon	Frear	Hutchinson	Major
Costello	Gallagher	Jacoway	Mann, Ill.

Mann, S. C.	Patterson	Robinson, N. C.	Strong, Pa.
Mason	Perlman	Rose	Sullivan
Mays	Porter	Rowan	Vare
Mead	Pou	Rowe	Volk
Merritt	Redcliffe	Sabath	Watson
Milligan	Rainey, Ala.	Sanders, Ind.	Whaley
Moon	Rainey, Henry T.	Sanford	Wilson, Ill.
Mooney	Rainey, John W.	Scully	Wilson, La.
Morin	Randall, Calif.	Sells	Wise
Mudd	Ransley	Small	Zihlman
Nelson, Wis.	Reed, W. Va.	Smith, N. Y.	
Nolan	Riddick	Steele	
Padgett	Riordan	Stiness	

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the joint resolution was passed, the objection of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. KAHN with Mr. DENT.
 Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. STEELE.
 Mr. MASON with Mr. GARRETT.
 Mr. MANN of Illinois with Mr. FLOOD.
 Mr. GOULD with Mr. RIORDAN.
 Mr. FORDNEY with Mr. HAYDEN.
 Mr. FOCHT with Mr. HARRISON.
 Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin with Mr. JACOWAY.
 Mr. ZIHLMAN with Mr. ASHBROOK.
 Mr. FREAR with Mr. DREWRY.
 Mr. RIDDICK with Mr. HOEY.
 Mr. VOLK with Mr. LEE of Georgia.
 Mr. SANDERS of Indiana with Mr. BELL.
 Mr. CURRIE of Michigan with Mr. DAVEY.
 Mr. CHINDBLOM with Mr. KITCHIN.
 Mr. EMERSON with Mr. CAREW.
 Mr. HUTCHINSON with Mr. EAGLE.
 Mr. WILSON of Illinois with Mr. KINCHELOE.
 Mr. HERSEY with Mr. SMALL.
 Mr. STINESS with Mr. CARTER.
 Mr. ANDREWS of Maryland with Mr. WISE.
 Mr. PATTERSON with Mr. MCGLENNON.
 Mr. MORIN with Mr. BLACKMON.
 Mr. ELLSWORTH with Mr. RANDALL of California.
 Mr. WATSON with Mr. HULL of Tennessee.
 Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania with Mr. BLAND of Missouri.
 Mr. BACHARACH with Mr. EVANS of Nevada.
 Mr. VARE with Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky.
 Mr. PORTER with Mr. FERRIS.
 Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. DOMINICK.
 Mr. KREIDER with Mr. LINTHICUM.
 Mr. LUFKIN with Mr. JONES of Texas.
 Mr. RANSLEY with Mr. WILSON of Louisiana.
 Mr. FISH with Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas.
 Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa with Mr. CANDLER.
 Mr. MUDD with Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY.
 Mr. ROSE with Mr. SULLIVAN.
 Mr. JAMES of Michigan with Mr. MAYS.
 Mr. NOLAN with Mr. MAHER.
 Mr. RADCLIFFE with Mr. CANTRELL.
 Mr. PERLMAN with Mr. DOREMUS.
 Mr. GOODALL with Mr. HERSMAN.
 Mr. MERRITT with Mr. PADGETT.
 Mr. BURKE with Mr. MEAD.
 Mr. SANFORD with Mr. MCKINIRY.
 Mr. KLESS with Mr. POU.
 Mr. REED of West Virginia with Mr. MOON.
 Mr. ROWE with Mr. SMITH of New York.
 Mr. ELSTON with Mr. CULLEN.
 Mr. HILL with Mr. CALDWELL.
 Mr. BOWERS with Mr. SABATH.
 Mr. SELLS with Mr. WHALEY.
 Mr. CLASSON with Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina.
 Mr. GLYNN with Mr. CLARK of Florida.
 Mr. KENDALL with Mr. GARD.
 Mr. McCULLOCH with Mr. GRIFFIN.
 Mr. HAMILTON with Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina.
 Mr. BAER with Mr. HAMILL.
 Mr. BRITTON with Mr. EVANS of Montana.
 Mr. BURROUGHS with Mr. BRUMBAUGH.
 Mr. EDMONDS with Mr. GALLAGHER.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

BODENSTAB AGAINST BERGER.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Elections No. 1, I submit the report on the contested election case of Bodenstab against Berger.

The Clerk read as follows:

Report on the election case of Bodenstab against Berger.

The SPEAKER. This is referred to the House Calendar.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 517. An act amending an act to provide for drainage of Indian allotments of the Five Civilized Tribes, approved March 27, 1914 (38th Stats., 310, Public, No. 77).

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I object.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until to-morrow, Sunday, February 6, 1921, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

398. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a request for an amendment to the fortifications bill for the fiscal year 1922, to permit completion of contracts made with manufacturers of airplanes prior to June 30, 1920; to the Committee on Appropriations.

399. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of the Chinese Government; to the Committee on Claims.

400. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copy of a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, transmitting report of the withdrawals and restorations of public lands in certain cases, as provided by law; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

401. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting a communication announcing the transmission of a duplicate copy of H. R. 12469 to the President of the United States.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. FIELDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 465) for the appointment of one member of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1295), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on Agriculture, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15945) authorizing an appropriation for the World's Poultry Congress, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1296), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the Committee on Agriculture, to which was referred the bill (S. 3944) to create a Federal live stock commission, to define its powers and duties, and to stimulate the production, sale, and distribution of live stock and live-stock products, and for other purposes, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1297), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HERNANDEZ, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 2728) for the relief of settlers and entrymen on Baca Float, No. 3, in the State of Arizona, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1298), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ESCH, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14469) to amend an act entitled "An act to create a Federal Power Commission; to provide for the improvement of navigation, the development of water power, the use of the public lands in relation thereto; and to repeal section 18 of the river and harbor appropriation act approved August 8, 1917, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1920, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1299), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DALLINGER, from the Committee on Elections No. 1, submitted a report (No. 1300) on the contested-election case of Henry H. Bodenstab against Victor L. Berger, which said report was referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15297) granting a pension to Nannie Roberts, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HUSTED: A bill (H. R. 16021) amending section 97 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSBORNE: A bill (H. R. 16022) directing the Secretary of War to cause examinations and surveys to be made of certain rivers and harbors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BLAND of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 16023) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Indiana, by its highway commission, to construct a bridge across White River at or near the town of Hazleton, Ind., on the Knox-Gibson County line; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 16024) to protect the name and insignia of the World War organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 16025) to authorize the incorporation of companies to promote trade in China; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 16026) to increase the revenues of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 16027) providing one German cannon or fieldpiece for the city of Albion, Mich.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Resolution (H. Res. 689) for the immediate consideration of Senate bill 3944; to the Committee on Rules.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, urging the passage of legislation authorizing the patrol of the forest by airplane; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, urging the help of the National Government in the support and extension of the Colorado State Soldiers' and Sailors' Home; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, urging an additional grant of 50,000 acres of land, for the construction and enlargement, repair, or maintenance of a soldiers' home; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FRENCH: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, urging the granting of unappropriated public lands within the State of Idaho for the construction and enlargement, repair, or maintenance of a soldiers' home; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 16028) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Holbrook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 16029) for the relief of Frederick W. Seidell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IRELAND: A bill (H. R. 16030) for the relief of Floyd Irving Lattin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H. R. 16031) for the relief of Joseph Clinton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: A bill (H. R. 16032) for the relief of William G. Phelps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 16033) granting an increase of pension to William A. Hartley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONAHAN of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 16034) granting a pension to Hannah E. Cawthorn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 16035) granting a pension to Ettie McPeck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16036) granting a pension to Lots A. Bentz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 16037) granting a pension to Sarah H. Y. Barber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIDDICK: A bill (H. R. 16038) granting a pension to James Duffy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 16039) for the relief of the owner of the boat *Gaylord*; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5509. By Mr. BABKA: Petition of the Cleveland (Ohio) Chamber of Commerce, against reductions as mentioned in House bill 15543; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5510. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against the reduction of appropriation for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce as approved in House bill 15543; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5511. By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of California Forest Protective Association, indorsing the Snell bill (H. R. 15327); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5512. By Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa: Petition of Rev. Theo. Wolfram and others of Charter Oak, Iowa, protesting against the occupation of Germany by French territorial troops; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5513. By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the Wisconsin Women's Progressive Association, urging passage of House bills 12749, 10925, 12078, and 11641, and Senate bill 3259; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5514. Also, petition of the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, urging passage of Senate bill 4613, also House bill 14961; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5515. By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petitions of Mrs. R. M. Kennedy, George V. McKinney, Mrs. John G. Brogden, Mrs. Harry M. Benzinger, Cathedral Christ Child Society, Mrs. Minnie J. Boggs, and Alumnae Association, Academy of the Visitation, all of Baltimore, Md., opposing the Smith-Towner bill; also, David E. Green, Baltimore Talmud Torah, and J. E. Teal, all of Baltimore, Md., favoring the Smith-Towner bill; also, Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Md., favoring Fess home economics; to the Committee on Education.

5516. Also, petition of William G. Ackenback, of Baltimore, Md., favoring return of trade relations with soviet Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5517. Also, petitions of Charles C. Homer, jr., William C. Robinson & Sons Co., the Kennedy Corporation, and J. Matwick, all of Baltimore, Md., favoring Winslow bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5518. Also, petitions of Frank Ware, J. Jenkins, Hennegen-Bates Co., Arthur N. Jenkins, John J. West, and McCormick & Co., all of Baltimore, Md., favoring turnover tax system; also, Cloverdale Spring Co., of Baltimore, Md., favoring elimination of 10 per cent tax on net sales of ginger ale, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5519. Also, petition of Greenwald Packing Co., of Baltimore, Md., opposing Senate bill 3944; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5520. Also, petition of Rev. William Schouler, of Baltimore, Md., favoring Jones-Miller bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5521. By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: Petition of citizens of Thayer County, Nebr., urging support of Britten resolution providing for an investigation of the conduct of the Senegalese and other colored troops in the occupied zone of Germany and urging the withdrawal of such colored troops from said territory; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5522. By Mr. MORIN: Petition of the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce, Pittsburgh, Pa., Mr. A. C. Terry, secretary, protesting against the passage of the Gronna bill as tending to a nationalization of industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5523. Also, petition of James Wettach, of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting in behalf of the meat-packing establishments against the passage of the Gronna and Hutchinson bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5524. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the J. H. Williams & Co., New York, N. Y., protesting against reduction in the consular appropriation bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5525. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, of Los Angeles, Calif., urging protective tariff for the fish-canning industry of the west coast; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5526. Also, petition of Pacific Coast Borax Co., of San Francisco, Calif., and others, urging the early passage of the Winslow bill (H. R. 15836); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5527. Also, petition of El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce, urging the passage of the Rogers-Capper bill for the re-

lief of ex-soldiers and sailors of the late war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5528. Also, petition of the foreign commerce department of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, urging adequate appropriations for promoting our foreign trade; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5529. Also, petition of John Thorpe, representative of the International Association of Machinists, of San Francisco, Calif., urging that the navy yard and arsenal employees may receive the \$240 increase in the legislative, judicial, and executive appropriation bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5530. Also, petition of W. B. Cahoon, president of the Bank of Tehama County, Red Bluff, Calif., relating to the salaries of Government employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

5531. By Mr. REBER: Petition of Robert C. Green, of Pottsville, Pa., opposing the proposed increase on jewelry-sales tax to 10 per cent and to taxes of \$10 a pound on gold used in the arts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5532. By Mr. RIDDICK: Petition of citizens of Great Falls, Mont., urging the recognition of the Irish republic, and urging that Great Britain be pressed to pay her war debt to the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5533. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of New York Produce Exchange, opposing the Gronna bill (S. 3944); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5534. Also, petition of Retail Dry Goods Association, of New York City, favoring the daylight saving bill, known as the Edge bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5535. By Mr. VARE: Petition of Major William McKinley Camp, No. 10, United Spanish War Veterans, Philadelphia, Pa., asking that Comrade Frederick A. Rouse be appointed as Deputy Commissioner of Pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SUNDAY, February 6, 1921.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by Mr. BUTLER as Speaker pro tempore.

The chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite Spirit, Our Heavenly Father, we would hallow Thy name in thought and deed, that Thy kingdom may come when every heart may be at one with Thee in intent and purpose.

We are met in pursuance of a long-established custom to honor the dead whom we hold sacred which sprang from the heart of man, implanted there by an unseen hand ages ago. Warm of heart, pure of motive, clear of perception, his soul sped in pursuit of the best in life; his countrymen were not slow to discover the inestimable traits of his character, hence he became a leader among men and an honored Member of this House, and left behind him a record worthy of emulation. His spirit lives though it has passed out of the body into a higher realm of usefulness. Solace the hearts of those who knew and loved him, especially his kindred dear, by the light of hope which leads on to eternal love. In Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL.

Mr. CRAGO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read the special order of to-day.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE MAHLON M. GARLAND.

The Clerk read as follows:

On motion of Mr. BUTLER, by unanimous consent, *Ordered*, That Sunday, February 6, 1921, at 12 o'clock noon, be set apart for addresses on the life, character, and public service of Hon. MAHLON M. GARLAND, late a Representative at large from the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CRAGO. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 670.

Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended, that opportunity may be given for tributes to the memory of Hon. MAHLON M. GARLAND, late a Member of this House from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That as a particular mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, and in recognition of his distinguished public career, the House, at the conclusion of these exercises, shall stand adjourned.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Resolved, That the Clerk send a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this ceremony, in memory of our colleague, Congressman GARLAND, brings us face to face with the tragedy which marks the close of every life, a tragedy which is as sad and deep and dark as can be woven of the warp and woof of mystery and death.

It is told of Walt Whitman, the Old Gray Bard of Democracy, that on one occasion he attended the funeral of a neighbor. The aged man, leaning on his cane, looked at the form lying so cold and still. A little girl came and stood on tiptoe by the old man's side, looking wonderingly at the face of the dead.

The poet, who had attained the allotted three score and ten years of life, turned and quietly said: "You do not understand this, do you, my dear?" "No, sir," lisped the girl in startled fashion. "Neither do I, neither do I," said the old man as he walked slowly away.

Neither can any of us understand the old, old mystery of death. We only know that sooner or later the Grim Reaper claims all men as his own. In the end the highest lies down with the lowliest, all alike impotent before the Angel of Death.

Everywhere and always there are farewells for the dying and mourning for the dead. In every life there are memories that are sadly dear; the sound of sobs of sorrow, the subdued tones of grief, the fluttering crape, the funeral procession, the weeping circle around the grave, the solemn words above it, the thud of clods upon the coffin, and then the vacant place, the broken home, the deathless memories of loved ones departed from us.

Every day brings new evidence of the truth of the message of that poem which was the favorite of Abraham Lincoln:

'Tis the twink of an eye, 'tis the draft of a breath,
From the blossom of youth to the paleness of death,
From the gilded salon to the bier and the shroud,
Oh, why should the spirit of mortal be proud?

Congressman GARLAND has but gone before in meeting the common fate of all. And as we bow, powerless and mystified before the perplexing puzzle of all the ages, we may thank God that above the solemn toll of the death knell sounds the peal of immortality, oversweeping all pains, all tears, all time, all fears; proclaiming in thunder tones, "Man lives forever. Death is but the golden key that unlocks the palace of eternity."

Congressman GARLAND's influence will not die, but will go on duplicating and reduplicating itself in many lives. His life and career prove that character is built out of circumstances turned to good account. Out of the same materials that some men have built hovels, he builded palaces, and he hammered and forged all the parts himself.

That America is only another name for opportunity was exemplified in the life of our late colleague. He was not born to wealth, but to struggle. He first saw the light of day in Pittsburgh, and spent almost his entire life in that mighty hive of industry, that workshop of the world. Like the city he loved so well, he was—

Swart with the soot of her furnaces,
He dripped with the sweats of toil,
His fingers throttled the savage waste,
He tore the curse from the soil,
He flung the bridges across the gulfs
That shut us from the To Be
And built the roads for the bannered march,
Of crowned humanity.

At the age of 9 years he began his life as a breadwinner. At the time when children are usually care free, he was toil weary. He labored through the years of play time, while a man's responsibilities rested upon his shoulders.

He made no complaints, but met every hardship with a smile and a spirit that was invincible. He marched along a road where stinging briars and rugged rocks lined the way. Sometimes a chasm cut across his path and a high wall upreared itself before him.

But with undaunted heart and boundless courage he leaped the chasm and scaled the wall, marching on to the goal of his desire, beginning his success where many end in failure.

Debarred by circumstances from securing what we call a higher education, Congressman GARLAND had that far more precious boon—wisdom of the heart. The ancients were right when, long before Harvey, they declared that the heart is the very center of life, the seat of the affections and courage. After all, the heart is the man.

There are those who say that training the mind, developing the brain, and cultivating the intellect are all that are needed in making a man. However valuable all these, it is nevertheless true that all such training only enables a man to do more. It is the heart which determines whether that "more" shall be good or bad.

Kind hearts are more than coronets
And simple faith than kingly blood.

As Congressman GARLAND grew up to maturity he knew instinctively that the closed hand can not receive. His hand was